



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

3 2044 010 364 107

Ann 11
US 14874.5.9



Rec. Jan. 13th,
1854.

Mr. 216

U.S. 14874. 5. 9

HISTORY

OF

NEW LONDON,

CONNECTICUT.

FROM THE FIRST SURVEY OF THE COAST IN 1612, TO 1852.

BY FRANCES MANWARING CAULKINS.

"I have considered the days of old, the years of ancient times." Pa. LXXVII. 5.




The Seal of New London, adopted in 1784.

NEW LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR.
1852.

11344, 687
U.S. 14874, 5-9

2.50 *Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1852, by*

F. M. CAULKINS,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Connecticut.



PRESS OF CASE, TIFFANY AND COMPANY, HARTFORD, CT.

P R E F A C E.

THIS work has not been hastily written, but is the result of several years of patient research. It originated in the first place, from a deep interest in the subject—a fondness for lingering in the avenues of the past, and of linking places, persons and events in historic association. The pleasure connected with the occupation has thus lightened the toil; yet it is not pretended that the work was undertaken with no view to its being published. It has been from ~~the first~~, the aim and hope of the author to produce a work worthy of publication—a history that would be honorable to her native place, and to those neighboring towns that were connected with it in their origin. New London county is a locality no way inferior in interest to any part of the state. Its early history is full of life and vivid anecdote. Here the white and the red race flourished for a time side by side; while hardships, reverses and adventures of various kinds marked its subsequent progress. A conviction of the fertility of this unexplored field of research, connected with the sentiment of veneration for a region that had been the refuge and home of her ancestors, in all their branches, led to a design, early formed and perseveringly cherished by the author, to write the history both of Norwich and of New London. Taste, leisure, opportunity, and above all the kind permission of a benignant providence, have concurred in allowing this design to be accomplished.

The divine command to “remember the days of old, and consider the years of many generations,” so often repeated in varying terms in Holy Writ, is an imperative argument for the preservation of memorials of the past. The hand of God is seen in the history of towns as well as in that of nations. The purest and noblest love of the olden time is that which draws from its annals, motives of gratitude and thanksgiving for the past—counsels and warnings for the future. It is the ardent desire of the writer to engage the present generation

in this ennobling study of their past history, and to awaken a sentiment of deeper and more affectionate sympathy with our ancestors, than has hitherto been felt. In the first place we find a band of exiles, far from their native land, and in great part strangers to each other, collecting together, acting together, and amid trials and embarrassments cheerfully encountered and bravely overcome, effecting a settlement upon this rugged coast; and following the course of years, we meet with generation after generation, who endured great and manifold fluctuations of fortune, as they successively labored to improve and enlarge their inheritance into those ample accommodations and facilities for future progress which we now enjoy.

The work is extended into a larger volume than was at first anticipated; yet such is the affluence of materials, that a second of equal size might easily have been prepared, had the author chosen to wander at large into the paths of family genealogy and individual biography. A prevalent object in view, was to illustrate the gradual progress of society, from the commencement of the township among the huts of the Indians, where the first planters found shelter, to its present maturity of two centuries. Many simple and homely traits, and slight incidents, are therefore admitted, which by themselves would seem trivial and below the dignity of history. "Posterity," said John Quincy Adams, "delights in details." This is true; but details are great incumbrances to the easy flow of narrative writing. Less precision on minor points, fewer dates and names, and greater license of description and imaginative sketching, would have rendered the work more uniform and interesting, yet it might have diminished its value for local reference.

In the spelling of Indian names entire uniformity has not been preserved. These names have not yet been reduced to any common standard, and the variations are innumerable. The point most perplexing to an historian is the transmutation that gradually takes place in the course of a series of records in the same name, as in Nayhantick or Naihanticut, now Niantic, and in Naywayonck, now Noank. There appears to be an absurdity in writing *Niantic* and *Noank*, when treating of the early history, and a species of affection in obtruding the old name against the popular orthography of the present day. In these words, therefore, and some others, a common uniform system of spelling has not been preserved.

C O N T E N T S.

	PAGE.
Introduction and outline map of the harbor,	18-17

CHAPTER I.—BEFORE THE SETTLEMENT.

Pequots, Mohegans and Nahantics, -	19-21	Ravage of Block Island, -	80
Block's survey of the coast, -	21-24	Visit to Pequot Harbor, -	80
Dutch map, 1616, -	28	Skirmish on the Groton side, -	82
Chart of the coast by R. Williams, -	24	Skirmish on the New London side, -	83
Outline map of the coast, -	25	Why Uncas joined the English, -	84, 85
English settlements on the Connecticut, -	26	Mason's expedition, -	85
Winthrop's contract for Nahantick, -	27	His march to Pequot Harbor, -	86
Stone and Norton, killed by Pequots, -	28	Stoughton's encampment, -	86
Oldham, killed at Block Island, -	29	Prisoners of the Owl's Nest, -	87
Endicott's expedition, -	29	End of the Pequot War, -	88

CHAPTER II.—FOUNDATION OF THE TOWN.

Winthrop family sketch, -	39	Natal day of New London, -	44
Grant of Fisher's Island, -	40	Commission of Winthrop and Peters, -	45
First grant at Pequot, -	41	Contest for the jurisdiction, -	46
Stoughton's recommendation, -	42	Winthrop brings his family, -	47
Peters, the coadjutor of Winthrop, -	43	Bride Brook marriage, -	48, 49
Proofs of a beginning in 1645, -	44	Indian name of Bride Brook, -	49
First European female at N. London, -	44	Outline map of the vicinity, -	49

CHAPTER III.—INDIAN NEIGHBORS.

Cochikuak, -	51	Winthrop favors the Nameangs, -	58
Uncas arrogant and surly, -	51, 52	Waueequaw the most troublesome Ind.,	58
The Nameangs timid and friendly, -	52	Foxen the wisest Indian, -	54
Indian hunt, -	52	Counsel of the elder Winthrop, -	54
Uncas favored by the commissioners, -	53	Horror of the Pequot name, -	55

CHAPTER IV.—EARLIEST TOWN ACTS.

Town officers, -	56	Name "Fair Harbor" proposed, -	64
By-laws of Nameang, -	57, 58	Bounds of the town enlarged, -	64
Alewife Brook, Foxen's Hill, -	57	Soldier grant, -	65
Poquanuck, Quittapeag, -	58	Deed of Uncas to Brewster, -	66
Nameang called Pequot, -	58	The town mill, -	66
First thirty-six grantees, -	59, 60	Grantees of 1650 and 1651, -	67, 68
Mamacock, Upper and Lower, -	60	Arrival of the minister, -	69
Land division east of the river, -	61	Grantees from Cape Ann, -	70
General sketch of the town plot, -	62	New, or Cape Ann Street opened, -	71
Court orders respecting Pequot, -	63	Earliest births, -	72

CHAPTER V.—GRANTEES AND TOWN AFFAIRS.

Preservation of records, - - -	78	Grant of the Mystic Islands, - - -	80
Moderator's minutes, - - -	74	Division of the Neck. Uhuhioh, - - -	81
At work on the mill dam, - - -	74	Cowkeeper's agreement, - - -	82
Green Harbor. Robin Hood's Bay, -	75	Salt-marsh. Wears. Quaganapoxet, -	82
Ballot for Deputies, - - -	75	Earliest deaths, - - -	82
The name "London" proposed, - -	76	The blacksmith. The lieutenant, - - -	83
Various grantees, - - -	75-78	Measures of defense against Indians, -	84
Grant of the present Parade, - -	77	Grantees. Harris legend, - - -	85, 86
Mason's grant at Mystic, - - -	78	Bream Cove. Lake's Lake, - - -	87
Chesbrough <i>versus</i> Leighton, - -	78	Innkeepers. Ferry lease, - - -	89
Chippachaug. Pequot-sepos, - -	78	Winthrop's removal to Hartford, - -	90
Indians of Nawayonk, - - -	79	His homestead and mill, - - -	91
Autographs of Mason and Gallop, -	79	Duties of the townsmen, (selectmen), -	92
Preservation of trees, - - -	79	Additional residents to 1660, - - -	93

CHAPTER VI.—FARM GRANTS.

Winthrop's Ferry farm, - - -	94	Stanton on the Pawcatuck, - - -	101
Nahantick and Neck grants, - - -	95	Minor's grant at Tagwourcke, - - -	102
Poquioh. Bruen's Neck. Fog Plain, 95		Grant to Gov. Haynes, - - -	102
Coanzie. The Mountain, - - -	95	Sold to Walter Palmer, - - -	102
Farms on the river (west side,) -	95, 96	Controversy for the jurisdiction, -	103
Poquannuck, and Mystic Fort Hill, -	96	Pawcatuck assigned to Mass., - - -	104
Groton Bank, and Pocketannuck, -	97	Made a town and named Southerton, 104	
Mashantucket. Lantern Hill, - - -	97	The decision reviewed and confirmed, 105, 6	
Grants at Mystic, - - -	98	Annulled by the charter of Chas. II., 106	
Wampassok. Mistuxpt. Quonaduck, 99		Southerton named "Mistick," - - -	106
Beginnings at Pawcatuck, - - -	99	"Mistick" named Stonington, - - -	106
Chesbrough at Wickutequock, 99, 100		Border difficulties, - - -	107

CHAPTER VII.—ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

The Barn meeting-house, - - -	108	Who composed the Welsh party, - - -	113
First regular meeting-house, - - -	109	Of what class were the pilgrims, -	113
The Sabbath drum and drummer, 109, 110		Mr. Blinman at Green Harbor, - - -	118
The cupola a watch-tower, - - -	110	At Gloucester. At New London, 114, 115	
Ancient burial-ground, - - -	111	His departure and autograph, - - -	116
Early notices of Mr. Blinman, 111, 112		At Newfoundland and Bristol, 116, 117	

CHAPTER VIII.—LOCAL NAMES.

Derivation of Nameaug & Tawaw-wog, 118		Mashantuck suggested, - - -	120
Sanction of the name "New London," 119		Original local names, - - -	121
What was the Indian name of the		List of Indian names, - - -	122-126
Thames? - - -	119		

CHAPTER IX.—INDIAN NEIGHBORS.

Committee to conciliate Uncas, - - -	126	Uncas and Foxen, wanderers, - - -	128
Narragansetts overrun Mohegan, - - -	127	Appointment of a Pequot missionary, 128	
Uncas besieged and relieved, - - -	127	Youths educated for Indian teachers, 129	
Invaded by Pocomicks and Narragan-		The two Pequot bands, - - -	129
settts, - - -	127	Where settled, - - -	130
Brewster's complaints, - - -	128		

CHAPTER X.—TOWN AFFAIRS TO 1670.

Contract with a new minister, - - -	131	Fort Hill. Sandy Point. The Spring, 133	
Parentage of Mr. Bulkley, - - -	132	Tongue's rocks, and the Bank, - - -	134
Moderator's minutes, - - -	132, 133	The book of laws. Town grievance, 135	

Allusion to whaling, - - - - -	186	Parsonage built, - - - - -	140
"Nahantick way-side," named Jordan, 186		Autographs of town-clerks, - - - - -	141
Various minutes. Pawcatuck rates, 186, 7		Scrivener or attorney. Jail, - - - - -	141
Guns from Saybrook, - - - - -	187	Wolves. Highways laid out, - - - - -	142, 143
Mr. Bulkley's ministry terminates, - - - - -	187	Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, - - - - -	143
Applications for a minister, - - - - -	188	Members of his church, - - - - -	144
Mr. Bradstreet engaged, - - - - -	189	New inhabitants to 1670, - - - - -	144-146

CHAPTER XI.—DIGRESSIONS.

Court on bankruptcy, - - - - -	147	Rate lists and assessments, - - - - -	151, 152
Affairs of Addis and Revell, - - - - -	147, 148	Deceased and non-resident proprietors, 152	
Mr. Tinker's popularity, - - - - -	149	Richard Lord's decease and epitaph, 152, 3	
The constable's protest, - - - - -	149	Removals before 1670, - - - - -	154
Thomson's deposition and autograph, 150		Doubts respecting Mr. Lake, - - - - -	154
Lieutenant Smith absconds, - - - - -	151	Biography of those who removed, 155-60	

CHAPTER XII.—BOUNDARIES.

Committees and reports on bounds, 161, 2		The Hammonasset, and the giant, 170	
Claim of Uncas disputed, - - - - -	163	The soldier grant. Obed land, 171	
Winthrop's letter to James Rogers, 164		A glance at Lyme, - - - - -	172
Treaty made and Uncas paid, 165		Tomb of Lady Fenwick, - - - - -	173, 174
Contest with Lyme, - - - - -	165-168	Lyme organized into a town, - - - - -	175
Mowing skirmish at Black Point, - - - - -	168	First settlers of Lyme, - - - - -	175, 176
Winthrop's testimony at the trial, 169		Black Hall. Mesopotamia, - - - - -	176, 177
Indians of Black Point, - - - - -	170	Meeting-house arbitration, - - - - -	177

CHAPTER XIII.—TOWN OFFICERS TO 1690.

Characteristics of the inhabitants, 179		Death of Winthrop, the founder, - - - - -	188
Original plan of the town, - - - - -	180	His family and estate, - - - - -	189
Breaking out of Philip's War, - - - - -	181	Second meeting-house built, - - - - -	190-192
Wait Winthrop's expedition, - - - - -	182	What became of the old one, - - - - -	192
Six houses fortified, - - - - -	183	Illness and death of Mr. Bradstreet, 193	
Major Treat's expedition, - - - - -	184	His church record, - - - - -	194
Swamp fight, - - - - -	184	Ministry of Mr. Oakes and Mr. Barnet, 195	
Indian auxiliaries, - - - - -	184	Mr. Saltonstall ordained, - - - - -	197
Wounded men brought to N. London, 185		"A large brass bell" procured, - - - - -	197
Three expeditions of Major Talcott, 185, 6		Saltonstall Sunday procession, - - - - -	198
The ten border raids, - - - - -	187	Epidemic fever and its victims, - - - - -	198
Men killed in Connecticut, - - - - -	188	Meeting-house burnt and another built, 200	

CHAPTER XIV.—THE ROGERENES.

James Rogers and his family, 201, 202		The perwig contribution, - - - - -	211
Founder of the Rogerene sect, - - - - -	203	The prison proclamation, - - - - -	212
First Sabbatarians of New London, 203		Mittimus against Rogers, - - - - -	212
Baptism in Winthrop's Cove, - - - - -	204	Long imprisonment in Hartford, - - - - -	213
Rogerene principles, - - - - -	204, 205	Suit of Mr. Saltonstall against Rogers, 213	
Penalties of the law, - - - - -	205, 206	Apology for both sides, - - - - -	214, 215
Will of James Rogers, - - - - -	207	Self-performed marriage rite, - - - - -	216
Elizabeth Rogers divorced from John, 208		Voluntary separation of the parties, 217	
Her subsequent marriages, - - - - -	208, 9	Warrant against Rogers as insane, 218	
Peter Pratt's book against Rogers, 209		He escapes to New York, - - - - -	219
Rejoinder of John Rogers, Jr., - - - - -	210	His last outbreak, - - - - -	219
Persecution on both sides, - - - - -	210, 211	His death, burial and writings, 220, 221	

CHAPTER XV.—THE LIVEEN LEGACY.

History of John Liveen, - - - - -	222	Mrs. Liveen's death and will, - - - - -	224
His will and executors, - - - - -	223	The Hallams contest the first will, 224	

Its validity established by the courts, 225	Appeal of Major Palmes, -	227, 228
Appeal of the Hallams to England, 226	Sketch of the Liveen legacy, -	228
The will sustained, - - -	226	

CHAPTER XVI.—EARLY COMMERCE.

Petition of the colony that New London might be made a free port, 229	Coit's building yard, - - -	288
Duties imposed on liquors, - - -	Newspaper notices, - - -	289
First vessels and their builders, - -	English officers of the customs, -	289
Coasters and skippers, - - -	Marine list in 1711, -	240
Protests of Mr. Loveland, - - -	Commercial memoranda, - - -	240, 241
Trade with Newfoundland, - - -	Jeffrey's large ships, -	242
Trade with Barbadoes, - - -	The society of trade and commerce, -	243
Vessels, builders, owners and masters, -	Dissolution of the society, -	244
285-288	Marine items and fleet of 1749, 244, 245	

CHAPTER XVII.—COURT RECORDS.

General remarks, - - -	246, 247	County court. Its officers, -	249
Cases before the justices' court, -	248	Cases before the county court, 250, 258	
Cases before the assistants' court, -	248	Prerogative or probate court, -	268
Capt. Denison's difficulties, -	248	Courts for trial of horse-couriers, 254-55	

CHAPTER XVIII.—EVENTS TO 1700.

Winthrop's campaign in New York, 256	The Province galley, - - -	258
Capt. Livingston's exile and marriage, 257	Act of addition to the town, - -	259
Petition to the mother country for aid in fortifying New London, 257	The patent and patentees, - -	259, 262
Fort built on the Parade, - -	The town commons, - - -	263
Guns brought from Saybrook, - -	Bank lots sold and court-house built, 263	
258	New inhabitants to 1700, - -	264-266

CHAPTER XIX.—OBITUARIES.

Customs at funerals, - - -	267	Catalogue of the dead, - - -	268-274
Tools and furniture, - - -	268	See Index of Names at the close of the	
Ancient men living in 1700, -	268	volume.*	

CHAPTER XX.—EVENTS TO 1750.

Post-offices and postage in 1710, -	375	His family, - - -	384
Scraps from the Boston News Letter, 375		Strife with Norwich respecting the	
Death of Gov. Fitz-John Winthrop, 375		courts, - - -	384
Mr. Saltonstall chosen governor, 376		Memorial to the governor on fortification, - - -	385
Summary of his character and ministry, 376		Appeal to the king threatened, -	387
Mr. Adams ordained his successor, 379		War with France and Spain, -	387, 388
Seating the people. Pew rivalry, 379		Second memorial rejected, -	389
Briefs and contributions, -	380	Petition to the king drafted, -	390
List and census for 1708 and 1709, 380		Expedition against Louisburg, -	391, 392
Incidents of the French War, -	381	Glimpse of D'Anville's fleet, -	393
Superior court first held in N. London, 382			
Death of Gov. Saltonstall. - -	382		

*The ancient apple-tree which is depicted in this chapter, (p. 284,) supposed to have been nearly coeval with the town, and to have borne fruit for one hundred and fifty years, was blown down in a high wind Sept. 11th, 1852, shortly after the page on which it appears was printed, and while the latter part of the work was yet in the press.

CHAPTER XXI.—MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS.

Children's manners, - - -	395	Jordan mill. Other mills, - - -	408, 404
Bartlet's legacy to the town school, - - -	396	Wolves continue troublesome, - - -	404
Grammar-school established, - - -	397	The great snow and snow sermon, - - -	405
First school-house, - - -	398	The moving rock at Jordan Cove, - - -	406
A free school among the farmers, - - -	399	Various amusements, - - -	406-409
Grammar-school in the North Parish, - - -	400	Memoranda, - - -	409
Rope ferry established, - - -	402	First execution, - - -	410
Account of the Ferry farm, - - -	402	Severe season of 1740-41, - - -	411
Winthrop's mill, - - -	403	Death of Winthrop in England, - - -	412, 418

CHAPTER XXII.—GROTON.

Groton incorporated, - - -	414	Autograph of Davie, - - -	417
Account of Sir John Davie, - - -	415	Ministers of Groton, - - -	418, 421
Packer's visit to Creedy, - - -	417	Baptist church of Groton, - - -	422, 423

CHAPTER XXIII.—THE NORTH PARISH.

First white settler in Mohegan, - - -	425	Cesar's deed to New London, - - -	430
Death of Uncas and Owaneco, - - -	426	Protest of Gov. Saltonstall, - - -	430
Meaning of their names, - - -	426, 427	Committee to settle the North Parish, -	431
Early grantees of Indian lands, - - -	427, 428	Ministry of Mr. Hillhouse, - - -	432
Great purchase at Mohegan, - - -	428	Ordination of Jewett, - - -	435
Deed of feoffment, - - -	428	Deacons of the church, - - -	436

CHAPTER XXIV.—BAPTIST CHURCH.

First regular Baptists, - - -	436	The Rowe legacy, - - -	437
Church built at Fort Hill, on the Neck, -	437	Gorton driven from the pulpit, - - -	438
by First and Seventh Day Baptists		Dissolution of the church, - - -	438
united, - - -	436	Baptist church organized in Lyme, - - -	439
Ministry of Elder Gorton, - - -	437		

CHAPTER XXV.—EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Formation of an Episcopal society, - - -	440	Glebe house built, - - -	445
Subscribers to build a church, - - -	440	Ministry of Mr. Graves, - - -	445
Church erected on the Parade, - - -	441	Difficulty during the Revolution, - - -	446
Anecdote concerning the steeple, - - -	442	Compelled to relinquish the pulpit, - - -	446
Seabury family, - - -	443	Retires to New York. His death, - - -	447
Ministry of Mr. Seabury in N. London, 443		Church destroyed in 1781, - - -	481

CHAPTER XXVI.—THE GREAT AWAKENING.

Preaching of Mr. Tennent, - - -	449	Davenport's last visit, - - -	454
Of Mr. Parsons and Mr. Davenport, - - -	450	Burning of the books and garments, - - -	455
Council at Killingworth, - - -	450	Trial of those concerned in it, - - -	456
Brainerd's letter to Dr. Bellamy, - - -	452	Accounts of it by Trumbull and Peters, 458	
Members withdraw from the church, - - -	452	Whitefield's visits to New London, 459, 460	
The Shepherd's Tent society formed, - - -	453	Notice of Rev. Jonathan Barber, - - -	461

CHAPTER XXVII.—EVENTS TO 1774.

New Style, - - -	462	Execution of Sarah Bramble, - - -	468
A Spanish vessel arrives in distress, - - -	462	Visit of Col. Washington, - - -	469
The cargo landed and partly stolen, 463, 4		Arrival of French neutrals, - - -	470
Conclave in Cedar Swamp, - - -	465	News paragraphs, - - -	470, 471
Escape of the culprits, - - -	466	First newspaper established, - - -	472
Conclusion of the affair, - - -	467, 468	Public events, - - -	473

Lotteries. Light-house, - - -	474	Anecdotes of the Cygnet, - - -	479
Alms-house. Ferry wharf. Bridge, - - -	475	Edict against barberry bushes, - - -	480
Fire engine. Business sketch, - - -	476	Celebration of the 5th of Nov., - - -	481, 2
Shipping and custom-house, - - -	477	Effects of the Stamp Act, - - -	482, 3
Second newspaper commenced, - - -	478	Sketch of the trade of the port, - - -	483-85

CHAPTER XXVIII.—ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

Ministry of Rev. Mr. Adams, - - -	486, 7	Tarring and feathering, - - -	494
Meeting-house struck by lightning, - - -	487	Mr. Byles relinquishes his office, - - -	495-98
Ministry of Rev. Mather Byles, - - -	489	Settlement of Mr. Woodbridge, - - -	498
Outbreak of the Rogerenes, - - -	490-494	His ministry and death, - - -	499, 500

CHAPTER XXIX.—REVOLUTIONARY TOPICS.

Townships in 1774, - - -	501	What was done in respect to tea, - - -	507
Various committees and delegations, - - -	502, 3	Shaw's purchases of powder, - - -	508
Records removed, - - -	503	Expedition of Commodore Hopkins, - - -	509, 10
Vote on the confederation, - - -	504	English collectors, - - -	511
Early advocates of freedom, - - -	505, 6	The Shaw family, - - -	512

CHAPTER XXX.—MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Details of militia, - - -	513, 14	The garrison. Militia in service, - - -	521
Companies at Bunker Hill, - - -	514	Marauders. Long Island traders, - - -	522, 23
Nathan Hale at New London, - - -	515	A year of alarms, - - -	523-526
Attack on Stonington, - - -	516	Army details, - - -	526
First alarm at New London, - - -	517	Exchanges of prisoners, - - -	527, 28
Reports on fortification, - - -	517-519	Further alarm and distress, - - -	529-531
Building Fort Trumbull, - - -	520, 521	Various worthy soldiers named, - - -	531-34

CHAPTER XXXI.—NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Privateering, - - -	535-542	Severe winter of 1779-80, - - -	543
State armed vessels, - - -	538	Account of the ship Putnam, - - -	543
Continental vessels, - - -	539, 40	Combat between the Trumbull and	
French ships in port, - - -	542	Watt, - - -	543

CHAPTER XXXII.—ARNOLD'S INVASION.

British expedition against the town, - - -	545	Incident of the wagon, - - -	565
Debarkation of the troops, - - -	546	Burning of Groton village, - - -	566
Flight of the inhabitants, - - -	547	Train laid to blow up the fort, - - -	566
March of the troops over Town Hill, - - -	549	Fire extinguished by Major Peters, - - -	566
Fort Trumbull evacuated, - - -	549	Loss on both sides, - - -	567, 570
March of Upham's division, - - -	551	Compensation by fire lands, - - -	570
Destruction of the town and incidents connected with it, - - -	552-557	What records were burnt, - - -	571
Landing on the Groton side, - - -	557	Anniversary celebrations, - - -	571
Storming of the fort and massacre of the garrison, - - -	557-564	Groton monument, - - -	572

CHAPTER XXXIII.—EVENTS TO 1800.

Morals and manners, - - -	573	Allen's marine list, - - -	578
Various seamen commemorated, - - -	574, 75	French emigrants, - - -	579
The plank vessel built, - - -	576	Loss of seamen in the West India ser-	
Execution of Hannah Okkuish, - - -	576	vice, - - -	581, 2
Death of Capt. John Chapman, - - -	577	Account of the yellow fever, - - -	583-85
Custom-house officers, - - -	577		

CHAPTER XXXIV.—CHURCHES.

Transient ministers, - - -	586	Bishop Seabury's ministry, - - -	598
Death by lightning, - - -	587	His successors, - - -	594
Congregational church of 1786, -	588	The Gothic church built, - - -	594
Ministry of Rev. Henry Channing, -	589	History of the Methodist society, -	595
Settlement of Rev. Abel McEwen, -	590	History of the Baptist churches, -	599
The Granite church built, - - -	591	Universalist church, - - -	599
Second Cong. Church established, -	591	Roman Catholica, - - -	600
Church of St. James re-erected, -	592	Epitaph on Bishop Seabury, - - -	600

CHAPTER XXXV.—THE ANCIENT TOWN REVIEWED.

Groton churches, - - -	601, 2	Waterford incorporated, - - -	609
Groton village, - - -	602	Niantic Bay and River, - - -	610
Sketch of Ledyard, - - -	603	Ancient Baptist church, - - -	611
Present condition of the Pequots, -	604	Elder Darrow's ministry, - - -	612
Montville organized, - - -	605	Other Baptist churches, - - -	613, 14
Its ecclesiastical history, - - -	606-609	Sketch of East Lyme, - - -	614, 15
Meeting-house struck by lightning, -	606	The old Synagogue, the stone church, 616	
Establishment of various churches, -	607, 8	Black Point and Niantic Indians, 617	

CHAPTER XXXVI.—EVENTS TO 1815.


City of New London incorporated, -	619	Execution of Pequot Harry, - - -	629
Succession of mayors, - - -	620	Second war with Great Britain, -	630
The town grammar-school, - - -	621	Decatur's squadron chased into the	
The Union school, - - -	622	port, - - -	631
Female academies, - - -	623	Blockade by the British fleet, -	631
The Bulkeley bequest, - - -	623	The torpedo attempt, - - -	632
The fort land, - - -	624	Gen. Burbeck takes command, -	633
The second burial ground, - - -	625	The blue light excitement, - - -	635
Alms-house built, - - -	626	Trips of the Juno, - - -	636
General survey of streets, -	626-629	Peace and festivity, - - -	637

CHAPTER XXXVII.—WHALING.

First whaling edict in Connecticut, -	638	Successful voyages and noted cap-	
Progress of American whaling, -	639	tains, - - -	648, 4
Its commencement at Sag Harbor, -	640	Statistics of the whaling business, -	645
The business commenced at N. London, 640		And of the California trade, -	646
And pursued from 1806 to 1808, -	641	Whaling merchants in 1852, and num-	
Revival in 1819, - - -	641	ber of ships owned by each firm, 647	
The earliest whale ships employed, -	642		

CHAPTER XXXVIII.—SUMMARY TO 1852.

Collectors of the port from 1789, -	648	Fire companies, turnpike companies, 658	
Commercial memoranda, - - -	649, 650	Ferry to Groton, - - -	659
Light-houses of New London district, -	650	Severe winters and width of the river, 660	
Dangers on the coast, - - -	651	Funeral of the Walton family, -	661
Fort Trumbull, - - -	652	Interment of the remains of Commodore	
First steam navigation, - - -	652	G. W. Rodgers, - - -	661
Voyage of the steam-ship Savannah; its captain and sailing master		Banks and other incorporations, 662, 63	
from New London, - - -	653	Railroads. Cedar Grove Cemetery, 664	
Newspapers published in 1852, - - -	654	Population at different periods, 665, 6	
Review of newspaper history, -	655-658	Various catalogues, - - -	667-672



HISTORY OF NEW LONDON.

INTRODUCTION.

In the eastern part of Connecticut is a river, named in honor of the Thames of England, which, about two miles from its mouth, forms the harbor of New London.

“Here fond remembrance stamp’t her much loved names ;
Here boasts the soil its London and its Thames,”¹

The mouth of the river lies directly open to Long Island Sound. It has no intricate channel, no extensive shoals or chains of islands, to obstruct the passage, but presents to view a fair, open port, inviting every passing sail, by the facility of entrance and security of anchorage, to drop in and enjoy her accommodations. The harbor is a deep, spacious and convenient basin ; abounding in choice fish, and its margin furnished with sandy beaches, finely situated for the enjoyment of sea air and sea bathing.

In the lowest spring tides the harbor has twenty-five feet of water, and this depth extends several miles above New London. Ships of the line may therefore enter at all times of the tide and ascend as far as Gale-town, seven miles from the mouth of the river. To this place there is usually in the channel a depth of twenty-seven feet, and vessels drawing eight feet of water find no difficulty in reaching Norwich, twelve miles from the mouth.

New London harbor is the key of Long Island Sound and the only naval station of importance between Newport and New York. In its capacious bosom a large fleet may find anchorage and ride out a tempest ; nor is there any port on the coast more advantageously situated for the reception of a squadron pursued by an overmastering

¹ Philip Freneau.

enemy. This was proved in the last war with Great Britain, when the United States, Macedonian and Hornet, closely pursued by a superior British force, put into the harbor and found a secure shelter. Commodore John Rodgers, who wintered here with his squadron in 1811, said it was the best ship harbor he had ever visited, except one: the exception was understood to be in Europe.

It is seldom closed by ice; remaining open through the whole winter, except in seasons of intense frost, which occur at intervals, sometimes of many years. Nor is it ever troubled with floating ice, for that which is made within the harbor or comes down the stream, owing to the course of currents off the mouth of the river, drifts directly out to sea.

The township of New London originally extended on the Sound from Pawcatuck River to Bride Brook, in Lyme, and on the north to the present bounds of Bozrah, Norwich and Preston. Within these limits there are now, east of the river Thames, Groton, Ledyard and Stonington, and west of the river, New London, Montville, Waterford and East Lyme. At the present day, in superficial extent, it is the smallest town in the state—less than four miles in length and only three-fourths of a mile in width. The city boundaries coincide with those of the town. The compact portion of the city is built upon an elevated semicircle, projecting from the western bank of the river, between two and three miles from the Sound.

Latitude of New London light-house, $41^{\circ} 18' 55''$.

Longitude west of Greenwich, $72^{\circ} 5' 44''$.¹

The outward appearance of New London, down to a period considerably within the precincts of the present century, was homely and uninviting. The old town burnt by Arnold, could boast of very little elegance; many of the buildings, through long acquaintance with time, were tottering on the verge of decay; and the houses that replaced them, hastily built by an impoverished people, were in general plain, clumsy and of moderate dimensions. Neatness, elegance and taste were limited to a few conspicuous exceptions. Moreover, the town had this disadvantage, that in approaching it, either by land or water, its best houses were not seen. It was therefore generally regarded by travelers as a mean and contemptible place. Within the period in which steamboats have traversed the Sound, a passenger, standing by the captain on deck, as the boat came up the harbor, exclaimed with energy, "*If I only had the money!*" "What would

you do?" inquired the commander. "*Buy that town and burn it,*" he quickly replied.

Since the utterance of this dire threat great improvements have been made. The city now contains ten structures for public worship, two of them new and elegant stone churches, in the Gothic style of architecture; a custom-house and county prison, both of granite; several extensive manufacturing establishments, two of which employ engines of great power and several hundred men; several blocks of stately brick buildings, in one of which is a spacious hall for public exhibitions; and many elegant private mansions. A railway, starting from the city and running nearly seventy miles north to the great Western road of Massachusetts, furnishes an eligible route to Boston and to Albany. A second railway, extending to New Haven along the margin of the Sound, completes the land communication with New York. And in the forefront of the town, admirably situated for the defense of the harbor, stands Fort Trumbull, a fine specimen of mural architecture, complete in design and finish, massive, new, and in perfect order.


Groton Monument overlooking the harbor is another impressive feature of the scene. Under its shadow lie the ruins of old Fort Griswold, from whose battlements a fine view is obtained of the town and the river. From the summit of the monument, the prospect to the south, of the Sound, its coasts and its islands, is absolutely peerless and magnificent.

Here lie Connecticut and Long Island, forever looking at each other from their white shores, with loving eyes, linked as they are by the ties of a common origin, congenial character and similar institutions; and guarding with watchful care that inland sea, which, won from the ocean, lies like a noble captive between them, subdued to their service and inclosed by their protecting arms.

How changed is this whole scene, landward and seaward, since the period when we may suppose the young, ambitious Winthrop, with knapsack and musket, under the guidance of some Indian chief, struggled through the wilderness from Saybrook, and pausing perchance on the summit of Town Hill, looked down upon the wild and solitary landscape! How his heart would beat, could he now stand upon that spot in the garb of mortality, with earthly feelings still yearning in his bosom, and survey the fair town which he first began to hew out of the wilderness! The Sound which he had navigated and admired; the harbor, whose commercial aptitude he must have discovered at a glance; the heights on the other side of the river, since named from his own birth-place; the Neck, where afterward,


in the infancy of the town, he built his house of rough stone and planted his orchard with English trees—all these enduring features remain the same as when they first broke upon his vision. But where he then saw only a confused mass of sterile rocks and stunted trees, or swamps and thickets, relieved only by a few Indian smokes that rose from their depths, there are now wharves, and spires, and fortresses ; trains of cars gliding over iron tracks ; hills furrowed with the cemeteries of the dead, and streets crowded with the mansions of the living.

How populous likewise have these waters become ! Then, perhaps a solitary canoe appeared on the horizon, or was seen dimly gliding along the weedy shores. Now, an ever changeful scene is presented to the eye. Barges and boats, whose oars drip liquid silver ; the light-keeled smack, with its slant sheet bearing up before the wind ; sloops and schooners, which, though built for use and deep with freight, display only ease and grace in form and motion ; the stout whale-ship, familiar with the high latitudes and counting her voyage by years, bound out or in, with hope in the one case and gladness in the other, paramount upon her deck ; and lines of steamers, the mediums of harmonious intercourse, making friends of strangers and neighborhood of distance, under whose canvas shades beauty reclines and childhood pursues its gambols with the comfort and security of land—are objects which, in the genial seasons, give a pleasing variety to the surface of the Sound.



Long. W. from Greenwich, $72^{\circ} 5' 44''$.

NEW LONDON HARBOR.



CHAPTER I.

Historical Sketch of the Pequots, and of their Country, previous to the Settlement of the English.

WHEN the English commenced their settlements upon Connecticut River, they found residing upon the sea-coast, in a south-easterly course from their plantations, a tribe of Indians, exceedingly fierce, warlike and crafty. These were the Pequots. Their immediate territory extended from Connecticut River to Wekapaug Creek, about four miles east of the Pawkatuck, and back into the country indefinitely, covering what is now New London county. On the southern coast, bordering upon Long Island Sound, they had their villages and fishing stations. Far and wide in the rear extended the hunting fields, the deer tracks, the war-paths of the tribe, and a shadowy depth of swamps and thickets, inhabited only by beasts of prey, or perchance a few rebels and outcasts, that had escaped from the tyranny of the sachem or from the fierce avenger of blood.

But the power of the Pequots was felt beyond these bounds. Other tribes had been overrun by their war parties, a tribute imposed, and a paramount dominion established. Prince, in his introduction to Mason's Pequot War, says that this tribe extended westward to Connecticut River, and over it as far as Branford, if not to Quinnipack (New Haven.) Gookin, in his account of the New England Indians, states that the sachem of the Pequots held dominion over a part of Long Island; over the Mohegans, the Quinnipiaks;

“ Yea, over all the people that dwelt upon Connecticut River, and over some of the most southerly inhabitants of the Nipmuck country.”

The central seat of the tribe was between the two rivers now known as the Thames and the Mystic. Their principal villages or hamlets were in the neighborhood of the latter, and were overlooked and guarded by two fortifications—one near the head of the river, on

a height still called Pequot Hill; and the other on a ridge nearer the Sound, known as Fort Hill; both in the eastern part of the present town of Groton. These posts were fortified villages, rather than forts; each consisting of a cluster of cabins, surrounded by a strong fence built of stakes, logs and interwoven trees.

On the west bank of the river now the Thames, were the Mohegans, with Uncas for their sachem; the southern border of whose territory was about six miles from the mouth of the river. Gov. Winthrop the elder, says that Uncas dwelt "in the twist of Pequod River;" meaning the bow-like portion of the river lying south of Trading Cove.¹ The chiefs of this tribe were of the royal family of the Pequots.

South of the Mohegans, down to the river's mouth, the natives were called by some early writers Mohegans, and by others Pequots. Subsequent to the Pequot War, the remnant that was left took the name of the place where they dwelt, and were distinguished as Nama-augs. They were undoubtedly of the true Pequot race.

About the mouth of Pawkatuck River and eastward of it, was a tribe called the Eastern Nahanticks, over whom the Pequots claimed authority, but who were sometimes in alliance with the Narragansetts.

Around Nahantick Bay (in Waterford and East Lyme) were the Western Nahanticks.² They had a fort or look-out post directly at the head of Nahantick River, and another on the summit ridge of Black Point, overlooking the Sound. Their hunting lands and fishing grounds extended west to Connecticut River.

These are all the aborigines of New London county of whom any account has been preserved. They all belonged to the wide-spread Delaware or Algonquin race, and used the same language, but with considerable variety of intonation and emphasis. The fact is now well established, that the difference in the aboriginal dialects of New

1 Winthrop's Journal, *sub ann. 1638*. "Unkus, *alias* Okoco, the Monahegan Sachem in the twist of Pequod River, came to Boston with 87 men." Okoco is doubtless a misprint for Okace, one of the names of Uncas, or rather, a slow, reverential way of pronouncing his name. Sassa-cus was likewise pronounced, at times, Sassa-cō-us and Sassa-quō-as. Pequot also with the o long, Pekō-ot, Pequō-ot. Unkus, as in the above extract from Winthrop, or Oukos, as in Mason's account of the Pequot War, would be better orthography for the sachem's name than Uncas; but where the sound is so nearly the same, it is needless to alter the current spelling.

2 Mason says: "About midway between Pequot Harbor and Saybrook, we fell upon a people called Nayanticks, belonging to the Pequots." Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. 18, p. 144.

England was not so great but that the tribes easily understood each other. With respect to the clans in the vicinity of New London, no material difference could be discerned in their physical conformation, their character or their customs. In government they formed a confederacy, and their chief sachem at this period was the powerful Sassacus. Uncas, the Mohegan chief, was his kinsman by blood, and probably also his son-in-law; for it is said that he had married, about ten years before the Pequot War, the daughter of Tatobam, the Pequot sachem: Tatobam was one of the names of Sassacus.

It is generally conceded by historians, that the Pequots were originally an inland tribe, dwelling north-east of the Hudson River, and belonging to that class of the aborigines termed Mohickans or Mohickanders; and that they reached the sea-coast by successive stages, conquering or driving away the older tribes that came in their way. It may be that the Nahanticks, on the east and west, were a people found upon the coast, subdued at first, and afterward intermingled with the conquerors. This would account for their readiness to throw off the Pequot yoke whenever an opportunity offered. But the Mohegans do not appear to have been in any way distinguished from the Pequots, except in name, and in this respect they were the older people,¹ retaining the original name. The designation of *Pequots* was no older than the father of Sassacus, from whom it was derived; he being called Wo-pequoit, or Wo-pequand, and sometimes Pekoath.²

The coast of New London county was first explored by the Dutch navigators, beginning with Capt. Adrian Block in 1614. This commander, in a small vessel constructed upon the banks of the Hudson—a yacht called the *Restless*,³ forty-four feet and a half long, and eleven and a half wide—passed through Hell-gate into the Sound, and examined the coast as far eastward as Cape Cod. He appears to have entered the principal harbors and ascended the rivers to some distance. Montauk Point he called Fisher's Hook, from the employment of the natives, who gained their chief subsistence from the sea.

¹ This agrees with the tradition of the Mohegans. The ancient burial-place of the sachems was in their domain, on the banks of the Yantick; now in Norwich. The sachems' graves at that place were mentioned on the first settlement of the town, many years before Uncas was buried there.

² The elder Winthrop, in his first notice of the tribe, in 1634, calls them Pequims; but the Dutch, who visited them twenty years before, noticed them as Pequatoos, and in the map drawn by these first explorers, they are laid down as Pequata. Winthrop's Journal, vol. 1; New York Hist. Coll., new series, vol. 1, p. 295.

³ O'Callaghan's New Netherlands, p. 72.

Fisher's Island probably received its name on the same account, or from its being a good position for fishing, but at a later period than Block's survey.¹ To Block Island he gave his own name, and it is accordingly laid down on the old Dutch maps as "Adrian's Eyland" and "Ad. Block's Eyland." This enterprising navigator so thoroughly explored the beautiful inland basin known as Long Island Sound, laying open its bays, rivers and islands to the view of the Old World, that we can not but wish it had obtained, in honor of him, the name of *Adrian's Sea*. We should then have a western Adriatic, appropriately so named, and not a servile imitation, as many of our names are, from the geography of Europe.

De Laet, an early Dutch geographer, and the first who has described with any minuteness the coast of Connecticut, compiled his account from the journals and charts of Adrian Block. His description of the coast of New London county is as follows:²


"Within the Great Bay [Long Island Sound] there lies a crooked point, [the Latin edition says, "in the shape of a sickle,"] behind which there is a small stream or inlet, which was called by our people East River, since it extends toward the east."

No one can doubt but that Watch Hill Point and Pawcatuck River are here indicated: the sickle form of the sandy cape and the easterly course of the river, identify them with precision.

"There is another small river toward the west where the coast bends, which our countrymen called the river of Siccanemos, after the name of the Sagimos [Sachem.] Here is a good harbor or roadstead behind a sand point about half a mile from the western shore, in two and a half fathoms water. The river comes for the most part from the north-east, and is in some places very shallow, having but nine feet of water at the confluence of a small stream, and in other places only six feet. Then there are kills or creeks with full five fathoms water, but navigation for ships extends only fifteen or eighteen miles. Salmon are found there. The people who dwell on this river, according to the statements of our people, are called Pequatoos, and are the enemies of the Wapanoos" [Wampanoags or Narragansetts.]

¹ Thompson (History of Long Island, p. 248) says that Fisher's Island was originally called Vissher's Island, and was so named by Block, probably after one of his companions. The same assertion has been made by other historians, but it does not appear on what authority. Its position is noted by the Dutch geographer De Laet, and it is laid down on the early Dutch maps, but no name is given to it.

² De Laet wrote his work both in Dutch and Latin: the latter, not being a translation of the former, but composed anew, varies from the other in some points. Translations from both works, of those parts which relate to the coast of New York and New England, are given in N. Y. Hist. Coll., new series, vol. 1; from which the extracts in the text are taken.



DUTCH MAP OF 1816.

The river here described was probably the Mystic. The variation of the soundings, the sand points, shoals and creeks, all apply to that neighborhood.¹ The Mystic, also, was peculiarly the river of the Pequots, although the name *Pequot River* was afterward given to the Thames, that being the largest river of the Pequot territory and the one principally visited by the English and Dutch traders. The tribe, however, was most numerous in the vicinity of the Mystic and their fortresses commanded its whole extent.

In some particulars the account is not precisely accurate; nor could we reasonably expect that the first rude survey of a coast embarrassed as this is, with creeks, coves and islands, should exactly correspond with charts made two or three centuries later. In a part of the description, it is evident that the Mystic is confounded with the river next surveyed. When it is said, "navigation extends fifteen or eighteen miles," we can not doubt but that the geographer has misplaced a fact which, in the original surveys, referred to the Thames.

The writer proceeds :

"A small island lies to the south-west by south from this river as the coast runs [Fisher's Island;] near the west end of it, a north-west by west moon

¹"Mistick River, or Harbor, is an arm of the sea navigable for vessels drawing sixteen feet of water, about two miles from its mouth: at that point obstructed by a bar of hard sand, about fifteen rods in width, allowing only thirteen feet depth at high water, with a channel above the bar, sixteen feet deep, up to the wharves. The navigation is impeded, also, in consequence of its channel being very crooked." [Asa Fish, Esq., MS.]

causes low water. We next find on the main, a small stream to which our people gave the name of the *Little Fresh River*, where some trade is carried on with the natives, who are called Morhicans."

Here we have the first glimpse of our own fair stream, with the name given it, probably by Capt. Block himself, in 1614. The adjunct *Little* was necessary to distinguish it from the Connecticut, which had been previously named by the Dutch, Fresh River. De Laet's Latin edition, which was written later than the other, does not name the Little Fresh River, but notices what is evidently the same stream, under another name :

"From thence the coast turns a little to the south, and a small river is seen, which our people named Frisius, where a trade is carried on with the Morhicans."

From all this it appears that the rivers on the coast of New London county, discovered and partially explored by the Dutch, were :


1. East River, or the Pawkatuck.
2. Siccanemos, or the river of the Sachem, now Mystic.
3. Little Fresh River, or the Frisius, now Thames.¹

Roger Williams, in a letter to Governor Winthrop, of Massachusetts, written in 1636, sketches a rude chart of the following geographical points on the Pequot coast passing from Connecticut River eastward by land:²

1. River Qunnihticut.
2. A fort of Nayantaquit men, confederate with the Pequots. [Head of Niantick Bay.]
3. Mohiganic River. [The Thames.]
4. Weinshauks, where Sassacous the chief sachem is. [Probably the royal fortress in Groton.]
5. Mistick Fort and River, where is Mamoho, another chief sachem. [The fort afterward taken by Capt. Mason.]
6. Nayantaquit, [Fort and River.]

1 In these Dutch accounts there are in fact four streams, instead of three, obscurely indicated; but this must be ascribed to the confusion produced by comparing different journals, since there is no such fourth stream between Connecticut River and Narraganset, except the Niantick, and on the charts made by these discoverers of the coast Niantick River and Bay are wholly omitted, which is presumptive proof that they were not explored. See N. Y. Hist. Coll., vol. 1, pp. 295, 307; also the Dutch map of 1616, in O'Callaghan. The original of this map was obtained in Holland, 1841, by J. Romeyn Broadhead.

2 Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 1, p. 161.



The Dutch having explored the coast of the Sound, and established a trade with the natives, claimed the country as an appanage of their province of New Netherland. For a number of years, the traders from New Amsterdam (now New York) almost exclusively resorted to this coast and engrossed the trade. It was their intention also to form settlements in these parts, and particularly on Connecticut River. In 1632, they bought of the natives a spot at the mouth of the river which they named Kievit's Hook,¹ (Saybrook,) and on the 8th of June, 1633, obtained an Indian grant of another parcel of land on the river, near where Hartford is situated. Here they erected a trading-post, and called it the House of Good Hope. They made preparations also to take possession of Kievit's Hook, but in both cases the English crowded in and retained possession. The latter asserted a priority of right, and had, in fact, extended their patents over the whole country east of the Hudson.

In the range of the year 1635, four English plantations were commenced upon Connecticut River; three of them by congregations that removed, each with its minister, from the Bay settlements. The people from Watertown settled at Wethersfield,² those from Dorchester at Windsor, and those from Newtown (alias Cambridge) at Hartford. The fourth settlement was made at Saybrook, by John Winthrop, Jun., who had received a commission from Lord Say and Seal, Lord Brook and others, patentees of Connecticut, to be governor of the river and the parts adjacent for one year. An advance party of twenty men, dispatched by him, sailed from Boston Nov. 3, and arriving at the mouth of the river, took possession of Saybrook Point. This party was just in time to prevent the occupation of the spot by the Dutch. A sloop from New Netherland arrived a few days afterward, with men and stores, to effect a settlement; but the English had mounted two pieces of cannon and would not permit them to land.

Little was effected in either of the four plantations before the succeeding year. Hartford was nearly broken up by the severity of the winter and a deficiency of provisions. At Saybrook, huts were erected for temporary shelter, and the place kept by Lion Gardiner, who had been sent over from England as engineer to erect the fortifications.

¹ Kieveet is the Dutch name for a shore bird called by us the Peeweeet. O'Callaghan, p. 149.

² Wethersfield is regarded as the oldest town on the river: some of the planters erected huts in 1634, and spent the winter on the ground. Trumbull, Hist. Conn.

fications. When the spring advanced, Mr. Winthrop entered on the work with vigor. Houses were built, a fortification erected, and a settlement commenced.¹

From the proceedings of Winthrop, it may be inferred that while in command at Saybrook, in 1636, he was looking forward to a settlement, on or near the river of the Pequots, as the next advance post to be taken by the English. He probably coasted along the shore, became acquainted with Fisher's Island and Pequot River, and perhaps fixed upon the spot now New London, as the site of a future town. Such a measure may have been within the scope of his instructions. At a subsequent period, when Massachusetts challenged the jurisdiction of the place, Mr. Fenwick, then the agent of the company, came forward "for himself and some noble personages," interested in the Warwick patent, and claimed the lands in question, asserting,

"That Pecos Harbor and the lands adjoining were of the greatest concernment to those interested in Connecticut River, and that they had a special aim and respect to it, when first they consulted about planting in those parts."²

As a preparatory measure to a settlement, Winthrop established a friendly intercourse with the sachem of the Western Nahanticks, called Sassyous,³ and entered into a verbal contract with him for a considerable portion of his territory. Relying upon the validity of this contract, he afterward claimed the lands of this tribe (now East Lyme and a part of Waterford) as his personal property, and, in 1647, applied to the Commissioners of the United Colonies, who had the charge of Indian affairs, to confirm his title. But they regarded the claim as vague and indefinite; Winthrop could show no writing, assign no date, describe no bounds. The Connecticut delegation opposed the claim; the court declined acting upon it; and the subject was never revived.⁴

In 1633, Captains Stone and Norton, two Englishmen engaged in the Indian trade, were killed in an affray with the Pequots in Con-

1 Trumbull.

2 See proceedings of the Commissioners of the United Colonies, in Hazard's Collection of State Papers.

3 Or Sashious. This name is so much like Sassacus, that one is at first tempted to deem it a misprint: yet it can hardly be supposed that this artless, confiding sachem was the terrible Pequot chief, described by the Indians as "*all one god—no man could kill him.*"

4 Hazard, vol. 2, p. 93. See also Trumbull's Hist. of Conn., vol. 1, ch. 8.

necticut River.¹ The Indians sent an embassy to Boston with explanations of this outrage, throwing the chief blame on the victims themselves, and offering a present, the customary token of amity. This present was received, though with reluctance, the explanation not being deemed satisfactory. The Indians were charged with duplicity, and though professing friendship, were supposed to be really hostile and ready at any favorable opportunity to cut off their English neighbors. This construction of their conduct appears to have been harsh and unmerited. Lion Gardiner and some other contemporaries thought more favorably of them. In reviewing the case, there appear strong grounds for believing that the whole Pequot confederacy, together with their sachem, were friendly to the English, at the time the latter commenced their settlements on the river. The massacre of the two English traders was evidently an unpremeditated affair, the sudden outbreak of minds exasperated by injury. Capt. Stone had maltreated the Indians; and they, turning upon their oppressor, slew him, partly in self-defense and partly in revenge. This offense had, moreover, been obliterated in their view of the case, by conciliatory embassies, by presents and a treaty; and they now turned with a placable, if not a friendly disposition, toward their new neighbors at Saybrook.

It is not to be assumed, however, that the friendship of the Pequots was founded on any higher principle than greediness of gain, or desire of obtaining assistance against the Narragansetts. The government of Massachusetts distrusted all their pretensions, and while Winthrop was still at Saybrook, sent instructions to him to demand of the Pequots "a solemn meeting for conference," in which he was to lay before them all the charges that had been brought against them; and if they could not clear themselves, or refused reparation, the present which they had sent to Boston, (and which was now forwarded to Saybrook,) was to be returned to them, and a protest equivalent to a declaration of war was to be proclaimed in their hearing.²

These instructions were dated at Boston, July 4th, 1636, and together with the present were brought to Saybrook by Mr. Fenwick and Mr. Hugh Peters, with whom came Thomas Stanton to act as interpreter. Lieut. Gardiner notes the arrival of Mr. Oldham at the same time, in his pinnace, on a trading voyage. The others came by land.

¹ Savage's Winthrop, vol. 1, p. 123.

² Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 2, p. 129.

The Pequot sachem was sent for, and the present, which consisted of "otter-skin coats, and beaver, and skeins of wampum," was returned. Lieut. Gardiner, who foresaw that a destructive war would be the consequence, made use of both argument and entreaty to prevent it, but in vain.

A new cause of complaint—not against the Pequots particularly, but affecting them as belonging to the great class of dangerous neighbors—was furnished about the same time. Mr. Oldham, while engaged in traffic with the natives of Block Island, was suddenly assailed by a large number of Indians and slain on the deck of his own pinnace. This barbarous act was avenged in a speedy and signal manner. John Gallop, another Indian trader, happening to be in that part of the Sound at the same time, discovered Oldham's vessel full of Indians, and suspecting what they had done, bore down upon them with repeated shocks, nearly oversetting the pinnace, and galling them the while with musket shot, which so terrified the Indians that ten out of the fourteen on board plunged into the sea and were drowned. Two others, Gallop succeeded in making prisoners, and one of these he bound and threw overboard.¹

The murder of Mr. Oldham caused great excitement. Not only all the Indians of Block Island, but many of the Niantick and Narragansett sachems were accused either of being accessory to the crime, or of protecting the perpetrators. An expedition was forthwith fitted out from Boston, for the purpose of "doing justice on the Indians" for this and other acts of hostility and barbarism. Ninety men were raised and distributed to four officers, of whom Capt. John Underhill, who wrote an account of the expedition, was one. The superior command was given to Capt. John Endicott. His orders were stern and vindictive:

"To put to death the men of Block Island, but to spare the women and children, and to bring them away, and to take possession of the island; and from thence to go to the Pequods, to demand the murderers of Capt. Stone and other English, and one thousand fathom of wampum for damages, &c., and some of their children for hostages, which if they should refuse they were to obtain by force."²

These orders were executed more mercifully than they were conceived. Endicott's troops did little more than alarm and terrify the natives by sudden invasions, threats, skirmishing, and a wanton destruction of their few goods and homely habitations. At Block

1 Winthrop's Journal.
3*

2 Ibid., vol. 1, p. 192.

Island they burnt two villages, containing about sixty wigwams, with all their mats and corn, and destroyed seven canoes. Capt. Underhill says that they also slew "some four Indians and maimed others." From thence they proceeded to Saybrook to refresh themselves, and obtaining from Lieut. Gardiner a reenforcement of twenty men in two shallops, they sailed for Pequot Harbor, in order to demand satisfaction for the murder of Captains Stone and Norton in 1633.

According to Capt. Underhill's narrative, they sailed along the Nahantick coast, (Lyme and Waterford,) in five vessels. The Indians discovering them came in multitudes to the shore, and ran along the water side, crying out, "What cheer, Englishmen? What cheer? Are you angry? Will you kill us? Do you come to fight? What cheer, Englishmen? What cheer?" They kept this up till the English came to Pequot River, which they entered, and during the night lay at anchor in the harbor, having the Nahantick Indians on the west side and the Pequots on the east, who made up large fires, and kept watch, fearing they would land.

"They made most doleful and woful cries all the night, hallooing one to another, and giving the word from place to place to gather their forces together, fearing the English were come to war against them."

The next morning the English vessels proceeded into the harbor. From the east side, now Groton, the natives flocked to the shore to meet the strange armament, apparently unconscious of offense. And now a canoe puts off from the land with an ambassador:

"A grave senior, a man of good understanding, portly carriage, grave and majestic in his expressions:"¹

who demands of the English why they come among them? The latter reply:

"The Governors of the Bay sent us to demand the heads of those persons that have slain Capt. Norton and Capt. Stone, and the rest of their company; it is not the custom of the English to suffer murderers to live."

The discreet ambassador, instead of an immediate answer to this demand, endeavored to palliate the charge. Capt. Stone, he said, had beguiled their sachem to come on board his vessel, and then slew him; whereupon the sachem's son slew Capt. Stone, and an affray succeeding, the English set fire to the powder, blew up the vessel and destroyed themselves. Moreover, he said, they had taken them

¹ Underhill's Narrative.

for Dutchmen ; the Indians were friendly to the English, but not to the Dutch, yet they were not able always to distinguish between them.

These excuses were not satisfactory : the English captain repeats his demand : " We must have the heads of these men who have slain ours, or else we will fight." We would speak with your sachem." " But our sachem is absent," they reply : " Sassacus is gone to Long Island."¹ " Then," said the commander, " go and tell the other sachem. Bring him to us that we may speak with him, or else we will beat up the drum, and march through the country and spoil your corn."²

Hereupon the messenger takes leave, promising to find the sachem : his canoe returns swiftly to the shore and the English speedily follow.

" Our men landed with much danger, if the Indians had made use of their advantage, for all the shore was high ragged rocks."³

But they met with no opposition, and having made good their landing, the Indian ambassador entreated them to go no further, but remain on the shore, till he could return with an answer to their demands. But the English imagining there was craft in this proposal, refused. We were " not willing to be at their direction," says Underhill, but " having set our men in battalia, marched up the ascent."⁴

From the data here given, it may be conclusively inferred that they landed opposite the present town of New London and marched up some part of that fair highland ridge, which is now hallowed with the ruins of Fort Griswold, and overshadowed by Groton Monument. To the summit of this hill, then in a wild and obstructed condition, the English troops toiled and clambered, still maintaining their martial array. At length they reach a level, where a wide region of hill and dale, dotted with the wigwams and corn-fields of the natives, spreads before them. And here a messenger appears, entreating them to stop, for the sachem⁵ is found and will soon come before them. They halt, and the wondering natives come flocking about them unarmed. In a short time some three hundred had assembled,⁶ and four hours were spent in parley. Kutshamokin, a Massachusetts sachem, that had accompanied the English, acted as interpreter, passing to and fro between the parties, with demands from one and excu-

1 Underhill.

2 Winthrop.

3 Underhill.

4 Winthrop.

5 Mommenoteck. Underhill.

6 Winthrop.

ses from the other, which indicate a reluctance on the part of Endicott to come to extremities, and great timidity and distrust on the side of the Indians. The object of the latter was evidently to gain time for the removal of their women and children, and the concealment of their choicest goods, which having in great part effected, the warriors also began to withdraw. At this point the English commander hastily putting an end to the conference, bade them take care of themselves, for they had dared the English to come and fight with them, and now they were come for that purpose.

Upon this the drum beat for battle, and the Indians fled with rapidity, shooting their harmless arrows from behind the screen of rocks and thickets. The troops marched after them, entered their town and burnt all their wigwams and mats. Underhill says:

“ We suddenly set upon our march, and gave fire to as many as we could come near, firing their wigwams, spoiling their corn, and many other necessities that they had buried in the ground we raked up, which the soldiers had for booty. Thus we spent the day burning and spoiling the country. Towards night embarked ourselves.”

According to Winthrop’s account, two Indians were killed and others wounded. Underhill says that numbers of their men were slain and many wounded. But Lion Gardiner, in his narrative, asserts that only one Indian was killed, and that one by Kutshamokin, who crept into a thicket, agreeably to the usual mode of Indian fighting, killed a man and brought off his scalp as a trophy. He ascribes the subsequent Pequot war, and all its atrocities, to the exasperation caused by this one act.

“ Thus far I had written in a book that all men and posterity might know how and why so many honest men had their blood shed, and some flayed alive, and others cut in pieces and roasted alive, only because Kichamokin, a Bay Indian, killed one Pequot.”¹

The next morning, Sept. 7th or 8th, the troops landed on the west side of the river, but had no conference with the natives.

“ No Indians would come near us, [says Underhill,] but run from us as the deer from the dogs. But having burnt and spoiled what we could light on, we embarked our men, and set sail for the Bay.”

1 Gardiner’s Pequot Wars.

Kutshamokin sent the scalp as a present to Canonicus, the Narragansett sachem, who triumphantly forwarded it from sachem to sachem through his country. Nothing could have roused the Pequots to greater rage than this triumph of their foes. Winthrop, vol. 1. p. 196.

On the 14th of September, Capt. Endicott and his troops arrived in Boston, and Gov. Winthrop notes it in his journal as "a marvelous providence of God that not a hair fell from the head of any of them, nor any sick or feeble person among them."

When the troops from Massachusetts departed, the two shallop and the twenty men that had joined them at Saybrook, were left behind in Pequot Harbor, waiting for a fair wind. While thus delaying, they had before them, in full view upon the west side, the fine fields of waving corn that surrounded the smoldering dwellings of the natives, which they had burnt the day before, and they resolved to secure the spoil. It was in expectation of some such booty, that Lieut. Gardiner had provided them with bags;¹ and now hastening to the shore, they filled their sacks with the silky ears, and returning, deposited their burdens in the shallop. They then went back for more, and had laden themselves with plunder a second time, when, on a sudden, frightful yells and thick-flying arrows, gave notice that they were surrounded by the infuriated savages.

Immediately they threw down their sacks and prepared for action. The Indians kept under covert, and only showed themselves a few at a time, when they darted forth, discharged their arrows, and again plunged into the thicket. The English were in an open piece of ground, and only half their number had muskets which could reach the enemy. These were arranged in single file, while the others stood in readiness to repel a direct assault.

This desultory skirmishing continued for most of the afternoon. The English supposed that they killed several Indians and wounded more, but the latter were too wary to hazard a direct encounter, and finding they could make no impression on their enemies, they became "weary of the sport," as the annalist says, "and gave the English leave to retire to their boat."² It is wonderful that the whole party was not cut off, as the Indians had them wholly in their power. Either from want of skill, or badness of position, they did little harm in this attack. Winthrop observes,

"Their arrows were all shot compass,³ so as one man standing single, could easily see, and avoid them; and one was employed to gather up their arrows.

¹ "Sirs, seeing you will go, I pray you, if you don't load your barks with Pequots, load them with corn." See Gardiner's Pequot Wars.

² Hubbard's Indian Wars.

³ "Compass-wise," says Hubbard. Probably it means, aiming higher than the object.

Only one of the English was wounded, being shot through the leg with an arrow."¹

There is no doubt but this conflict took place on some part of the present site of New London. This and the burning of the wigwams and canoes by Endicott's men the preceding day, are the first historical incidents connected with the spot. They are otherwise of but trifling importance.²

Endicott's expedition, timid and unproductive as it seemed to be, accomplished one object thoroughly: it drove the Pequots into determined hostility. From this time forth they displayed toward the English the most inveterate hatred. With a thirst which only savage bosoms could feel, they longed to plunder, to torture, to exterminate the detested race; to drink their blood and eat their flesh. The religious systems of heathenism are hostile not only to the moral virtues, but even to human sympathies; and there is no doubt but that savages find an actual pleasure in the excitement of diabolic cruelty. Their savage customs harmonize with the character of their deities; they have never learned to check an appetite, to forgive an injury, or to love an enemy.

The Mohegans, from the commencement of the contest, acted with the English. They were no better than the Pequots; the two tribes were equally destitute of the arts of civilized life, and of the social and humane virtues. But one was a proud and conquering people; the other tributary and prudent. The respective chieftains were formed on the model of these peculiar characteristics. Sassacus was overbearing, impulsive and fierce; Uncas, wary, intriguing and plausible. Both, in their intercourse with their white neighbors, were swayed by the same motives, temporal advantage, or the passionate desire of revenge.

1 Winthrop, 1. p. 197.

2 Trumbull, in Hist. Conn., ch. 5, states that the English party in this skirmish consisted of Capt. Underhill and twenty of the Massachusetts troops who had stayed behind to reinforce the garrison at Saybrook; but this is evidently a mistake. Underhill's narrative of the expedition gives no account of it, for the plain reason that he had the day before sailed with the troops to Narragansett. It was not till the next April that he was sent with twenty men to Saybrook. Capt. Gardiner particularly states that *his* men were left behind at Pequot when the others sailed; that they had a skirmish with the Indians, and that they brought home a quantity of corn, he having taken the precaution when they went away to supply them with sacks for the purpose. The commander of this little party, who seems to have conducted the affair with skill and cool intrepidity, is no where mentioned. Winthrop, in his Journal, Hubbard in Indian Wars, Increase Mather and Lion Gardiner, all have recorded the incident with little variation.

At the time of the first arrival of the English colonists upon Connecticut River, Uncas had quarreled with his liege lord, and driven from his territory, had taken refuge with a few adherents among the Indians in the vicinity of Hartford and Windsor. Banished men and outlaws, poor and oppressed, they naturally attached themselves to the English; in the first place for protection, and afterward for vengeance against a common enemy. Their only hope was in the destruction of the Pequots, and they joined in the contest with earnestness and good faith. It was the commencement of an alliance between the English colonists and the Mohegans, which never met with any serious interruption. No instance has occurred from that time to the present, in which any portion of the tribe has been found in arms against the colony. It is not often that an ignorant and passionate people remain so true to their interest. On the other side, the colony ever afterward considered itself the guardian of the tribe, and down to the present time, has acted as its friend and protector.

The cruelties perpetrated by the Pequots hastened their destruction. The conflict was short. A body of men from the three towns on the river, under the valiant Capt. John Mason, aided and guided by the Mohegans and Narragansetts, and favored by various providential circumstances, came suddenly upon a stronghold of the Pequots, consisting of a collection of wigwams inclosed with a log palisade, standing in an elevated position, near the head of Mystic River, and by fire and slaughter destroyed the whole encampment. This event took place on Friday, May 26, 1637.¹ Our subject does not lead us to treat of the conflict in detail.

After the destruction of the fort, Capt. Mason was obliged to march through the heart of the enemy's country to meet his vessels at Pequot harbor. The tract over which he had to pass, still rugged and irksome to the traveler, was at that time a trackless, and literally, a howling wilderness, haunted not only by wild beasts, but by wilder human foes, breathing deadly enmity and revenge. It required men, such as those fathers of Connecticut were—men of enduring sinew, as well as fearless spirit—to fight the terrible battle, and perform the arduous march of that renowned day. Twenty of their number were wounded; their ammunition was expended; their Indian allies were too timid and fearful to be any security to them, and the enemy, numerous and infuriated, hung upon their rear through the whole march. Yet they kept in close order, steadily pursuing their course, carrying

¹ Massachusetts Hist. Coll. 2d ser. vol. 8, p. 141, note.

their wounded, and fighting their way through swamp and thicket. It was a happy moment, when in the words of the gallant leader of the party,

"Marching on to the top of an hill adjoining to the harbor, with our colors flying, (having left our drum at the place of our rendezvous the night before,) we see our vessel there riding at anchor, to our great rejoicing, and come to the water side, we there sat down in quiet."¹

At Pequot Harbor they were joined by Capt. Patrick, with a Plymouth company, who came to the scene of action too late to take a part in it. Having sent the greater part of his wearied troops home by sea, Capt. Mason with twenty men, and Capt. Patrick with his company, and the great body of their Narragansett allies, who had kept with them, and durst not return home through the Pequot country, landed on the west side of the river (New London) and proceeded through the woods to Saybrook.

In June, Capt. Stoughton, with 120 men from Massachusetts, accompanied by the Rev. John Wilson, as chaplain, arrived at Pequot Harbor. This was the usual place of rendezvous for the troops of the three colonies. The object of Stoughton's expedition was to extirpate, if possible, the remaining Pequots. In pursuance of this object, he pitched his camp on the west side of the harbor, where he built a *house* or *houses*, and kept his head-quarters for two months or more.² We may suppose these quarters to have comprised a large barrack for temporary summer shelter, and some huts or wigwams near it; the whole surrounded with fascines or palisades for defense. Rude as this encampment may have been, it merits a conspicuous place in our

1 Mason's Narrative. It is stated that during this retreat they were continually fired at by warriors concealed behind rocks and trees; yet not an arrow reached them. The Indian allies that accompanied the English, had a skirmish with the Pequots, which Underhill thus describes: "They came not near one another, but shot remote, and not point-blank, as we often do with our bullets, but at rovers, and then they gaze up in the sky to see where the arrow falls, and not until it is fallen, do they shoot again." Of this mode of warfare he says: "They might fight seven years and not kill seven men."

2 In a subsequent part of this history, the conjecture is hazarded that Stoughton's encampment was on the neck, now occupied by Fort Trumbull. One of the pleas afterward propounded by Massachusetts in support of her claim to the jurisdiction of the west side of the river, was that of first possession, founded on the fact that Capt. Stoughton had built *houses* there during the Pequot war. The Connecticut agents in their rejoinder speak of it in the singular number, as *the house* which the people of the Bay built, and which themselves afterward carried off, or at least a great part of it. Hazard, vol. 2.

annals, as the first English house erected in New London. And here probably a Sabbath service was held by Mr. Wilson, and the solemn accents of Christian worship were intermingled for the first time with the voices of the desert.

Capt. Stoughton found it no easy task to clear the coast and contiguous country of the ill-fated Pequots. At one time he came upon the trail of a retreating party, and pursued them beyond the Connecticut, where losing the track, he desisted and returned to his former position.¹ Yotash, a Narragansett chief, with a band of warriors, was with him, and proved an efficient aid in hunting out the concealed Pequots.² Having tracked a large party of the fugitives to the deep recesses of a thicket or swamp, on the east side of the river,—probably the noted place of refuge of the Pequots, called by them Ohomowauke, or the Owl's Nest, and sometimes Cuppacommock, or the Hiding-place,³—he led Capt. Stoughton and his men thither, who surrounded the swamp and took more than 100 prisoners. They were a feeble, half-famished party, that yielded to the conquerors without offering the least resistance. Let pity drop a tear at their fate. The sachem⁴ was reprieved for a time, upon his promise of assisting the English in their search for Sassacus; the women and children, about eighty in number, were reserved for bondage: the doom of the remainder will be given in the words of the historian of the Indian wars, Rev. William Hubbard, of Ipswich.

“ The men among them, to the number of thirty,⁵ were turned presently into Charon's ferry-boat, under the command of skipper Gullup, who despatched them a little without the harbor.”

It is sad to think that the pure waters of our beautiful river should have closed over the fate of these unresisting children of the forest.

¹ Winthrop's Journal, vol. 1, p. 232.

² R. Williams, (Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. 21, p. 168,) in alluding to the Pequot captain taken prisoner by Yotash, and reserved for future service, says, he was kept under guard in the *English houses*, using the plural number. The text attempts to reconcile the different authorities by supposing that Stoughton erected a kind of block-house, with a cluster of huts around it, all surrounded by an inclosure, which gave it a kind of unity.

³ Williams, *ut supra*, p. 160. Afterward known as the Pine, or Mast Swamp of Groton.

⁴ Not two sachems, as some have represented, but one, with the long and apparently double name of Puttaquappuonck-quame.

⁵ Winthrop says twenty-two; Trumbull, twenty-eight; thirty men were taken in the swamp, and he subtracts two for the long-named sachem.

Mr. Wilson had left the army before this execution took place. The commanders by whose authority it was performed, acted in conformity with their instructions and the spirit of the age. The precise date of this awful act of vengeance has not been ascertained: it was near the last of June, 1637.¹ Capt. Stoughton was joined in his encampment by Mr. Haines, Mr. Ludlow, Capt. Mason, and thirty or forty men from the towns on Connecticut River—also by Miantinomoh, the Narragansett chief sachem, and 200 warriors, who came over by land. Uncas and his men, with the whole Nahantick tribe, were also within call. What a brave and stirring scene for that olden time, was exhibited on this promontory, then so wild and gloomy,—now beautified by cultivation, and covered with a fair town!

The Pequots as a nation were soon nearly extinct. Guided by Indian allies who knew every pass of the country, the English forces pursued them to the west by sea and land, carrying destruction with them. The haunts of the fugitives were discovered, many warriors killed, and women and children captured. Their chief and his few followers fleeing from the hot pursuit, were chased along the coast, with a haste and vigilance that left no chance of escape; and driven upon the weapons of the Mohawks, another equally unrelenting foe, they perished: and in that day no one pitied them.

So little did our ancestors understand the true spirit of Christianity, in regard to the ignorant natives of the land, that they appear to have swept the Pequots from existence without any misgivings of conscience or sensibility. In the work of destruction they displayed neither reluctance nor compunction; and at the close of it sang hymns of thanksgiving to God, ascribing their success to the wisdom of those measures, which his providence had inspired, approved, and crowned with success. An overruling power was indeed making use of their instrumentality, to accomplish its wise designs. The wilderness has been subdued, the face of nature beautified by cultivation; villages have sprung up like blossoms, and cities like stately trees; churches have been multiplied, and the living God is now acknowledged and honored in a region that for ages had been devoted to the worship of evil spirits.

¹ Winthrop records it under date of first week in July; Trumbull has the marginal date of June. It must have been the last of June or first of July. Capt. Stoughton arrived at Pequot "a fortnight after the Connecticut forces reached home,"—that is, about the middle of June. He returned to Boston, August 26th.

CHAPTER II.

The Founder of New London.—His personal history.—Grants of Fisher's Island.
Settlement of Pequot Harbor.—Natal day.—Commission from Massachusetts.
First planters.—Bride Brook marriage. 1645, 1646.

JOHN WINTHROP, the younger, eminently deserves the title of Founder of New London. He selected the site, projected the undertaking, entered into it with zeal and embarked his fortune in the enterprise. His house upon Fisher's Island was the first English residence in the Pequot country. He brought on the first company of settlers, laid out the plan of the new town, organized the municipal government, conciliated the neighboring Indians, and determined the bounds of the plantation.

The family seat of the Winthrops in England, was at Groton, in Suffolk. Hence the name of Groton, bestowed on those lands east of the river, which were at first included in New London. Adam Winthrop, of Suffolk, was a gentleman of fair estate and honorable character: the maiden name of his wife, which was *Still*, we find preserved among his descendants. Their oldest son, *John*, was the leader of that second Puritan emigration from England, which settled the colony of Massachusetts, and is justly considered the founder of Boston. His first wife, whom he married at a very early age, was Mary, daughter of John Forth, Esq., of Great Stanbridge, Essex;¹ and of this marriage, the eldest child was John, known with us as John Winthrop, the younger,—Governor of Connecticut, and the person in whose history, as founder of New London, we are now particularly interested. He was born February 12th, 1605—6. At the age of sixteen he was sent to the University of Dublin, where he continued about three years.² In 1627, when twenty-one years of age, he was in the service of the unfortunate Duke of Buckingham, in the fruit-

¹ Savage. Notes to Winthrop's Journal, vol. 1, p. 164.

² Savage. (MS.)

less attempt to assist the Protestants of Rochelle, in France. He married, February 8th, 1630-1, Martha, daughter of Thomas Fones, Esq., of London,¹ and arrived in Massachusetts with his wife Nov. 2d, the same year. This lady died at Agawam, (Ipswich,) May 14th, 1634,² leaving no children.

After her death, Mr. Winthrop spent some time in England, where he married, Feb. 12th, 1635, Elizabeth, daughter of Edward Read, Esq., of Wickford, in Essex,³ and returned with her to this country. He arrived the next October,⁴ and having been commissioned by the patentees of Connecticut, to build a fort and begin a plantation at Saybrook, (as before mentioned,) was immediately occupied with that business. But the commission was only for one year, and we have no account of its renewal. In 1638 and '39, he was living at Ipswich, where he set up salt-works at Ryal side.⁵ October 7th, 1640, he obtained from the General Court of Massachusetts, a grant of Fisher's Island, so far as it was theirs to grant, reserving the right of Connecticut, if it should be decided to belong to that colony.⁶ In order therefore to obtain a clear title, he applied to Connecticut, and was answered by the Court as follows:

" April 9, 1641.

" Upon Mr. Winthrop's motion to the Court for Fysher's Island, it is the mind of the Court that so far as it hinders not the public good of the country, either for fortifying for defence, or setting up a trade for fishing or salt, and such like, he shall have liberty to proceed therein."⁷

The islands in Long Island Sound were at first very naturally regarded as lying within the jurisdiction of Connecticut. But in 1664 they were all included in the patent of New York, and Connecticut having reluctantly yielded her title, Winthrop obtained from Governor Nicholls, of New York, a *patent*, bearing date Mar. 28th, 1668, which confirmed to him the possession of Fisher's Island, and declared it to

¹ Savage. *Gleanings in Mass. Hist. Coll.* 2d series, vol. 8, p. 207.

² Felt's *Hist. of Ipswich*.

³ She was baptized at Wickford, Nov. 27th, 1614. Savage, MS.

⁴ Hugh Peters, a Puritan divine, came over at the same time, with the expectation of settling in America. It is probable that he was the step-father of Mrs. Winthrop. Peters is said to have married a gentlewoman of Essex, about the year 1625, (see *Gen. Reg.*, vol. 5, p. 11,) and there are reasons for supposing that she was the relict of Edward Read, Esq. See *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, 3d series, 10, 2, 27.

⁵ Felt, p. 73.

⁶ *Ut supra*.

⁷ *Colonial Records of Connecticut*, vol. 1, p. 64.

be "an entire enfranchised township, manor and place of itself, in no wise subordinate or belonging unto or dependent upon, any riding, township, place or jurisdiction whatever."¹

Winthrop's title to Fisher's Island was therefore confirmed by three colonies.² This island had been a noted fishing ground of the Pequots; it was also a fine park for the huntsman, the woods that densely shaded the interior being well stocked with deer, and other wild animals. In the days of Indian prosperity, it must have been a place of great resort, especially in the summer season. Canoes might be seen gliding over the waves, children sporting on the shore, women weaving mats on the grass, and hunters with bow and arrow plunging into the thickets. After the destruction of the Pequots, this fair island lay deserted, unclaimed, waiting for a possessor. Winthrop seized the favorable moment, and became the fortunate owner of one of the richest gems of the Sound.

But he appears to have been in no haste to occupy his grant. After it was confirmed by Connecticut, in 1641, he went to England, and was long absent. Returning in 1643, he brought over workmen, stock and implements to establish iron works; which were soon commenced at Lynn and Braintree, and for a time, were prosecuted with zeal and success.³ Mr. Winthrop had an investigating turn of mind, and a great love for the natural sciences. His education had been scientific; he was fond of mineralogical pursuits, and ever on the watch to detect the treasures concealed in the bosom of the earth, and to bring them forth for the benefit of man.

It is probable that he commenced building and planting on Fisher's Island, in the spring of 1644, before he obtained the following grant from the General Court of Massachusetts.

"1644, June 28. Granted to Mr. Winthrop, a plantation at or near Pequod for iron works."⁴

By *Pequod*, we must understand the territory lying around Pequot harbor: the word *plantation*, is indefinite, but doubtless merely implied a liberal sufficiency of land for the contemplated works. It seems to have been well understood between Mr. Winthrop and the

¹ Thompson's Hist. of Long Island, p. 249.

² Thompson states that Winthrop *purchased* the island in 1644. The facts in the text show that it was a free grant from Massachusetts, confirmed by Connecticut and New York.

³ Savage: notes to Winthrop, vol. 2, p. 213.

⁴ Felt, p. 73.

magistrates, that he was to take possession of the Pequot territory, and throw it open for immediate occupancy and settlement. The special grant to himself was but the first stroke of this main design. Many persons in the Bay colony had fixed their minds upon Pequot harbor as a desirable place for a new plantation. The position was the best on the coast for trade with the Indians and the Dutch, and they naturally wished to reap the advantage, by anticipating their neighbors on Connecticut River, and settling it as a colony under their jurisdiction.

Capt. Stoughton, while encamped at Pequot in 1637, had written to the Governor and Council, recommending it as a good site for a plantation. His letter was apparently in answer to enquiries made by them. After mentioning the principal defect in the country—the entire absence of meadows—and that for the most part it was too rocky for the plough,—he proceeds to state that “the upland is good.”

“Indeed, were there no better, 'twere worthy the best of us, the upland being, as I judge, stronger land than the bay upland.

“But if you would enlarge the state and provide for the poor servants of Christ, that are yet unprovided, (which I esteem a worthy work,) I must speak my conscience. It seems to me, God hath much people to bring hither, and the place is too strait, [i. e., the settlements in the Bay,] most think. And if so, then considering, 1st, the goodness of the land; 2d, the fairness of the title; 3d, the neighborhood to Connecticut; 4th, the good access that may be thereto, wherein it is before Connecticut, &c., and 5th, that an ill neighbor may possess it, if a good do not,—I should readily give it my good word, if any good souls have a good liking to it.”¹

Capt. Stoughton's opinion of the goodness of the land, though given with caution, was perhaps too favorable. The ancient domain of the Pequots, Mohegans and Nahanticks, must have been in its original state, a wilderness of stern and desolate character. An underlying base of rock, is every where ambitious to intrude into light, and often appears in huge masses heaped together, or broken, and tossed about in wild disorder. Places often occur, where the surface is actually bristled with rocks, and as a general fact, the country is uneven and the soil hard to cultivate. A large amount of physical energy must be expended, before the way is prepared for ordinary tillage and the improvements of taste. It was no light task that lay

¹ The name *Connecticut*, was then confined to the plantations on the river: Pequot was not a part of it.

² Sav. Win., vol. 1, app., p. 400, where Stoughton's letter is given entire. “From Pequid, 2d day of the 6th week of our warfare.”

unaccomplished in the future, to clear away the tangled forests, reclaim the stony pastures, the rugged hill tops and miry swamps, and soften down the stern landscape to fertile fields and pleasant gardens.

In the summer of 1645, we find the work actually commenced. Winthrop is at Pequot Harbor, engaged in clearing up the land, and laying out the new plantation. With him,—heart and hand in the undertaking,—is Mr. Thomas Peters, the brother of Hugh. This gentleman was an ejected Puritan clergyman from Cornwall, England, who had been officiating as minister of Saybrook; or more properly as chaplain to Mr. Fenwick and the garrison of the Fort.¹ He entered cordially into the project of a new settlement, with the expectation of becoming a permanent inhabitant, and doubtless of exercising his sacred functions in the place.

This was the summer in which Pessacus, the Narragansett sachem, with a large number of warriors, breathing vengeance for the death of Miantonomoh, invaded Mohegan, and with flight and terror before him, broke up the principal village of the tribe. The women and children, as usual, fled to woods and hiding-places, and Uncas and his warriors, after a severe conflict, in which many of them were wounded, took refuge within the inclosure of their principal fort, where they were besieged by their foes. Hunger would soon have brought them to a disgraceful submission, had they not been relieved by the timely arrival of a boat-load of provisions sent by Capt. Mason, from Saybrook. Favored by the darkness of the night, and the want of vigilance in the invaders, this supply was safely conveyed into the fortress. In the morning, the Narragansetts discovering that not only the necessities of Uncas were relieved, but that he was encouraged by the presence and protection of the English, suddenly relinquished the siege and departed.

Messrs. Winthrop and Peters also went to the scene of conflict, probably with the design of mediating between the parties, but reached the spot just after the flight of the invaders.

A letter written by Mr. Peters to the elder Winthrop, at Boston, respecting this Indian foray, is extant, in which he says—

“I with your son, were at Uncus’ fort, where I dressed [the wounds of] seventeen men, and left plasters to dress seventeen more, who were wounded in Uncus’ brother’s wigwam before we came.”²

¹ Successor to Mr. Higginson. The date of his arrival in this country is not ascertained. He was at Saybrook in 1643. (Half-century Sermon of Rev. Mr. Hotchkiss, of Saybrook, and Trumbull’s Connecticut.)

² Sav. Win., vol. 2, app., p. 380.

There is yet other proof that Winthrop was on the ground, *beginning* the plantation, or preparing its way, in 1645. Roger Williams addressed a letter

"For his honored, kind friend, Mr. John Winthrop, at Pequot—These—
Nar. 22. 4. 45." [Narraganset, 22 June, 1645.]

In this letter he observes:—"William Cheesbrough now come in shall be readily assisted for your and his own sake,"—implying that Chesebrough came from Pequot with advices from Mr. Winthrop. At the close of his letter he adds,—"Loving salutes to your dearest and kind sister."¹

The lady to whom allusion is here made, as being then at Pequot, was Mrs. Lake. She is often mentioned in subsequent letters of the same series, and was probably the sister of Mrs. Winthrop. How she came to be present in the rude encampment of this first summer, before Mr. Winthrop brought on his wife and children, and when no better accommodations could be furnished than those of the woodman's tent, or the Indian wigwam, can not be accurately stated. In the absence of proof, the supposition may be made, that she had been dwelling at Saybrook with the Fenwicks and Mr. Peters, and came with the latter to the infant settlement.²

Honor to Margaret Lake! the first European female that trod upon our fair heritage.

Here then are three persons who can be named as being upon the ground in the summer of 1645. Without doubt a small band of independent planters were also engaged in laying out and fencing lots, erecting huts, and providing food for their cattle. We learn from subsequent claims and references, that the marshes and meadows in the vicinity, were mowed that year, viz:—at Lower Mamacock, by Robert Hempstead; at Upper Mamacock, by John Stebbins and Isaac Willey; and at Fog-plain, by Cary Latham and Jacob Waterhouse.³ It is likewise probable that Thomas Miner and William

¹ Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 9, p. 268. Chesebrough was engaged in the Indian trade.

² If, as is conjectured, Mrs. Winthrop and Mrs. Lake, were the step-daughters of Hugh Peters, Mr. Thomas Peters, according to current acceptation, was their uncle.

³ Of Latham, we have incidental testimony from Winthrop himself, who, in a document upon record, says that he was with him "in the beginning of the plantation." The first grants of Robert Hempstead, have in the old book of grants, the marginal date of 1645.

Morton belonged to this advance party. It may be conjectured that some eight or ten planters remained through the season, accommodated partly in the huts of the Indians, and that Mr. Winthrop, Mr. Peters, and Mrs. Lake retired to Boston, before winter came on with severity.

That a beginning of the plantation was thus made in 1645, is further placed beyond doubt, by the court order issued for its government the next year, which speaks of it as already begun, and this being early in the season, must refer to what was done the preceding year. But all historians who have treated of the settlement of New London, have placed its commencement in 1646. And as a settlement or *sitting down*, as our fathers termed it, supposes permanent habitations and municipal laws, that period is the most accurate. There is a manifest propriety in dating the existence of the town, from the time when the commission for government was issued, and we are happily enabled to determine the point in this manner.

THE NATAL DAY OF NEW LONDON, 6TH OF MAY, 1646.

“ At a General Court held at Boston, 6th of May, 1646. Whereas Mr. John Winthrop, Jun., and some others, have by allowance of this Court begun a plantation in the Pequot country, which appertains to this jurisdiction, as part of our proportion of the conquered country, and whereas this Court is informed that some Indians who are now planted upon the place, where the said plantation is begun, are willing to remove from their planting ground for the more quiet and convenient settling of the English there, so that they may have another convenient place appointed,—it is therefore ordered that Mr. John Winthrop may appoint unto such Indians as are willing to remove, their lands on the other side, that is, on the east side of the Great River of the Pequot country, or some other place for their convenient planting and subsistence, which may be to the good liking and satisfaction of the said Indians, and likewise to such of the Pequot Indians as shall desire to live there, submitting themselves to the English government, &c.

“ And whereas Mr. Thomas Peters is intended to inhabit in the said plantation,—this Court doth think fit to join him to assist the said Mr. Winthrop, for the better carrying on the work of said plantation. A true copy,” &c. New London Records, Book VI.

The elder Winthrop records the commencement of the plantation under date of June, 1646.

“ A plantation was this year begun at Pequod river, by Mr. John Winthrop, Jun., [and] Mr. Thomas Peter, a minister, (brother to Mr. Peter, of Salem,) and [at] this Court, power was given to them two for ordering and governing the plantation, till further order, although it was uncertain whether it would fall within our jurisdiction or not, because they of Connecticut challenged it by

virtue of a patent from the king, which was never showed us." "It mattered not much to which jurisdiction it did belong, seeing the confederation made all as one; but it was of great concernment to have it planted, to be a curb to the Indians."¹

The uncertainty with respect to jurisdiction, hung at first like a cloud over the plantation. The subject was discussed at the meeting of the commissioners at New Haven, in September, 1646. Massachusetts claimed by conquest, Connecticut by patent, purchase and conquest. The record says:

"It was remembered that in a treaty betwixt them at Cambridge, in 1638, not perfected, a proposition was made that Pequot river, in reference to the conquest, should be the bounds betwixt them, but Mr. Fenwick was not then there to plead the patent, neither had Connecticut then any title to those lands by purchase or deed of gift from Uncus."

The decision at this time was, that unless hereafter, Massachusetts should show better title, the jurisdiction should belong to Connecticut. This issue did not settle the controversy. It was again agitated at the Commissioners' Court, held at Boston, in July, 1647; at which time Mr. Winthrop, who had been supposed to favor the claims of Massachusetts, expressed himself as "more indifferent," but affirmed that some members of the plantation, who had settled there, in reference to the government of Massachusetts, and in expectation of large privileges from that colony, would be much disappointed, if it should be assigned to any other jurisdiction.

The majority again gave their voice in favor of Connecticut, assigning this reason—"Jurisdiction goeth constantly with the Patent."²

Massachusetts made repeated exceptions to this decision. The argument was in truth weak, inasmuch as the Warwick Patent seems never to have been transferred to Connecticut,—the colony being for many years without even a copy of that instrument. The right from conquest was the only valid foundation on which she could rest her claim, and here her position was impregnable.

Mr. Peters appears to have been from the first, associated with Winthrop in the projected settlement, having a coördinate authority and manifesting an equal degree of zeal and energy in the undertaking. But his continuance in the country, and all his plans in regard to the new town, were cut short by a summons from home,

1 Sav. Winthrop, vol. 2, p. 265.

2 Records of the United Colonies. (Hazard, vol. 2.)

inviting him to return to the guidance of his ancient flock in Cornwall. He left Pequot, never to see it again, in the autumn of 1646.¹ In November he was in Boston preparing to embark.²

Mr. Winthrop removed his family from Boston in October, '46; his brother, Deane Winthrop, accompanied him. They came by sea, encountering a violent tempest on the passage, and dwelt during the first winter on Fisher's Island. A part of the children were left behind in Boston, but joined their parents the next summer; at which time, Mr. Winthrop having built a house, removed his family to the town plot.³ Mrs. Lake returned to the plantation in 1647, and was regarded as an inhabitant, having a home lot assigned to her, and sharing in grants and divisions of land, as other settlers, though she was not a householder. She resided in the family of Winthrop until after he was chosen governor of the colony, and removed to Hartford. The latter part of her life was spent at Ipswich.

Governor Winthrop, of Massachusetts, regarded the new plantation with great interest. As a patriot, a statesman and a father, his mind expatiated upon it with hope and solicitude. A few days after the departure from Boston of his son, with his family, he wrote to him:

“ The blessing of the Lord be upon you, and he protect and guide you in this great undertaking.”

“ I commend you and my good daughter, and your children, and Deane, and all your company in your plantation, (whom I desire to salute,) to the gracious protection and blessing of the Lord.”

To this chapter may properly be added the relation of a romantic incident that occurred at an early period of the settlement, and which

¹ Edward Winslow, in his work “ New England's Salamander Discovered,” written in England in 1647, has this passage: Mr. Thomas Peters, a minister that was driven out of Cornwall by Sir Ralph Hopton in these late wars, and fled to New England for shelter, being called back by his people, and now in London, &c.

² Sav. Win., vol. 2, app., p. 352. His wife never came to this country. See Gen. Reg. vol. 2, p. 68, where in a letter to the elder Winthrop, he complains that though he had written many letters to his wife and brother, he “ never could receive one syllable from either.”

³ See letters from the elder Winthrop to his son, in the appendix to Savage's Winthrop. They are directed to Fisher's Island, until May, 1647, when the address is “ To my very good son, Mr. John Winthrop, at Nameage, upon Pequot river.” Mr. Winthrop's children, Elizabeth, Wait-Still, Mary and Lucy, were left for the first season in Boston. Probably Fitz-John and Margaret, the latter an infant, came with their parents. Martha was born at Pequot in July or August, 1648. Anne, the youngest child, was also in all probability born here, but neither of these births are on our records.

had an important bearing on the western boundary question that subsequently threw the town into a belligerent attitude toward Lyme.

In March, 1672, when the controversy in respect to bounds between New London and Lyme was carried before the Legislature, Mr. Winthrop, then governor of the colony, being called on for his testimony, gave it in a narrative form ; his object being to show explicitly, that the little stream known as Bride Brook, was originally regarded as the boundary between the two plantations. The preamble of his deposition is in substance as follows :

“ When we began the plantation in the Pequot country, now called New London, I had a commission from the Massachusetts government, and the ordering of matters was left to myself. Not finding meadow sufficient for even a small plantation, unless the meadows and marshes west of Nahantick river were adjoined, I determined that the bounds of the plantation should be to the brook, now called Bride Brook, which was looked upon as certainly without Saybrook bounds. This was an encouragement to proceed with the plantation, which otherwise could not have gone on, there being no suitable accommodation near the place.”

In corroboration of this fact, and to show that the people of Saybrook at first acquiesced in this boundary line, the governor related an incident which he says “ fell out the first winter of our settling there.” This must have been the winter of 1646-7, which was the first spent by him in the plantation. The main points of the story were these :

A young couple in Saybrook were to be married : the groom was Jonathan Rudd. The governor does not give the name of the bride, and unfortunately the omission is not supplied by either record or tradition. The wedding day was fixed, and a magistrate from one of the upper towns on the river, was engaged to perform the rite ; for there was not, it seems, any person in Saybrook duly qualified to officiate on such an occasion. But, “ there falling out at that time a great snow,” the paths were obliterated, traveling obstructed, and intercourse with the interior interrupted ; so that “ the magistrate intended to go down thither was hindered by the depth of the snow.” On the sea-board there is usually a less weight of snow, and the courses can be more readily ascertained. The nuptials must not be delayed without inevitable necessity. Application was therefore made to Mr. Winthrop to come to Saybrook, and unite the parties. But he, deriving his authority from Massachusetts, could not legally officiate in Connecticut.

“ I saw it necessary [he observes] to deny them in that way, but told them for an expedient for their accommodation, if they come to the plantation


it might be done. But that being too difficult for them, it was agreed that they should come to that place, which is now called Bride Brook, as being a place within the bounds of that authority whereby I then acted; otherwise I had exceeded the limits of my commission."

This proposition was accepted. On the brink of this little stream, the boundary between two colonies, the parties met: Winthrop and his friends from Pequot, and the bridal train from Saybrook. Here the ceremony was performed, under the shelter of no roof, by no hospitable fireside; without any accommodations but those furnished by the snow-covered earth, the overarching heaven, and perchance the sheltering side of a forest of pines or cedars. Romantic lovers have sometimes pledged their faith by joining hands over a narrow streamlet; but never, perhaps, before or since, was the legal rite performed, in a situation so wild and solitary, and under circumstances so interesting and peculiar.

We are not told how the parties traveled, whether on horseback, or on sleds or snow-shoes; nor what cheer they brought with them, whether cakes or fruit, the juice of the orchard or vineyard, or the fiery extract of the cane. We only know that at that time conveniences and comforts were few, and luxuries unknown. Yet simple and homely as the accompaniments must have been, a glow of hallowed beauty will ever rest upon the scene. We fancy that we hear the foot-tramp upon the crisp snow; the ice cracks as they cross the frozen stream; the wind sighs through the leafless forest, and the clear voice of Winthrop swells upon the ear like a devout strain of music, now low, and then rising high to heaven, as it passes through the varied accents of tender admonition, legal decision and solemn prayer. The impressive group stand around, wrapped in their frosty mantles, with heads reverently bowed down, and at the given sign, the two plighted hands come forth from among the furs, and are clasped together in token of a life-long, affectionate trust. The scene ends in a general burst of hearty hilarity.

Bride Brook issues from a beautiful sheet of water, known as Bride Lake or Pond, and runs into the Sound about a mile west of Giant's Cove. In a straight line it is not more than two miles west of Niantick Bay. The Indian name of the pond, or brook, or of both, was Sunk-i-pang or Sunkipaug-suck.¹

¹ "Sunkipaug means cold water. In Elliot's Indian Bible, Prov. 25: 25, he has, As *sunkipog* [cold water] to a thirsty soul, &c. So in Matthew, 10: 42.—Whosoever shall give *sunkipog* [a cup of cold water] to one of these little ones," &c. (S. Judd, MS.)



SKETCH OF BRIDE BROOK.

It received the name of Bride Brook on the spot, at the time of the nuptial celebration. Winthrop in his deposition, (which is on file among the state records at Hartford,) says, "*and at that time the place had (i. e., received) the denomination of Bride Brook.*" That a considerable company had assembled is evident from the narrative, which alludes to those present from Pequot, and to the gentlemen of the other party, who "*were well satisfied with what was done.*"

Thus it appears that Bride Brook was originally the western boundary of New London. It had been fixed upon as the terminus between her and Sayboook, anterior to the marriage solemnized upon its eastern brink, though it obtained its name from that occurrence.

CHAPTER III.

Indian neighbors.—The Nameugs and Mohegans.—Hostility of Uncas.—Proceedings of the Commissioners relative to the Pequots.

THE whole extent of the new settlement was a conquered country. No Indian titles were to be obtained, no Indian claims settled. It was emphatically, as it was then called, *Pequot*; the land left by an extinguished tribe; or if not extinguished in fact, legally held to be so, and doomed to extinction. According to Winthrop's own testimony,¹ before laying out the plantation, he collected all the neighboring Indians in one assembly in order to ascertain the legitimate bounds occupied by the Pequot tribe, that no encroachment might be made on the rights of the Mohegans, and that Uncas then made no pretence to any land east of the river, nor claimed on the west side any further south than Cochikuack, or Saw-mill brook, and the cove into which it flows.² This therefore was the northern boundary.

Uncas was at first much in favor of the settlement of Winthrop in his neighborhood, and made him a present of wampum in token of satisfaction. He was then in want of aid against the Narragansetts. But his strong attachment to Major Mason, and others of the Connecticut magistrates, operated to produce distrust of a company that belonged to another jurisdiction. To add to this estrangement, a local jealousy arose. The remnant of the Pequots that survived the struggle of 1637, (and they were more numerous than had been supposed at the time,) were principally assigned to the care of Uncas, and subjected to a burdensome tribute. A small settlement of these Indians was found by the English on the site selected for their plantation. They were Pequots, but called, from the place they inhab-

¹ Letter of the governor, June, 1686, on Co. Court Records.

² About six miles north of New London Harbor, where is now the village of Uncasville.

ited, by the distinctive name of Nameaugs or Namearks. The chief man among them was Cassasinamon, to whom the English gave the familiar name of *Robin*.

These Indians received the English with open arms. Themselves, their huts, and all their scanty accommodations, were at their disposal. They served as guides, messengers, assistants and servants, and they were repaid with friendship and protection. The English interfered to soften the rigor of Uncas, and abate his unreasonable exactions. The courtesy with which he at first received them, therefore, was soon changed to jealousy and distrust. The first years of the plantation were rendered tumultuous and uneasy by his threats. Straggling bands of savage warriors, surly and defying, were often seen hovering about the settlement, to the great terror of the inhabitants.

The agents of the plantation say :

"He quickly took offence and fell to outrages; his carriage hath been since as if he intended, by alarms and affrightments, to distrust and break up the plantation."¹

The first considerable breach of the peace occurred in the summer of 1646. The circumstances were briefly these. Mr. Peters had been indisposed, and while recovering, requested the Nameaugs to procure him some venison. The latter hesitated, through fear of Uncas, their liege lord, who arrogated to himself the sole privilege of making a hunt within his dominions. Being encouraged, however, to make the attempt, and counseled to hunt east of the river, and to go, as if from an English town, with Englishmen in company, Robin, with twenty of his men, and a few of the whites, crossed the river, and uniting with another band of Pequots and Eastern Nahanticks, under Wequashkook, went forth in bold array, to drive the deer through the vast wilderness on that side of the river. But Uncas obtained notice of their design, and lay in wait for them with 300 men, armed for war. Seizing the favorable moment, he burst forth upon the unprepared sportsmen, with all the noise and fury of an Indian onset, and pursued them with great clamor and fierceness back to the plantation. The arrows flew thick, and some of the Pequots were wounded. Some Indian habitations were plundered, and cattle driven away. Slight losses were also sustained by the English. The Mohegan warriors, on their return homeward, showed

¹ Records of the Commissioners in Hazard, vol. 2.

themselves on the hills near the town plot, making hostile demonstrations, that filled the small band of settlers with perplexity and apprehension.

The Court of Commissioners of the United Colonies, to whom the adjustment of all Indian affairs belonged, met in September at New Haven. Mr. Peters, by letter, complained of the outrage committed by Uncas. Wm. Morton also appeared in person as agent of the plantation, accompanied by three Nameaugs, and preferred various charges against Uncas; all corroborating the fact that he maintained an insolent and threatening attitude toward the English, and was uniformly cruel and oppressive to the Pequots. The sachem being confronted with his accusers, had the address to prove them in the wrong, except in the matter of alarming and disturbing the English, by vindicating his right, and punishing his rebellious subjects, so immediately in their vicinity. For this offense he apologized, and was let off with a reprimand. Mr. Morton and his three witnesses were rather unceremoniously dismissed, and the Nameaugs were imperatively commanded to return to their allegiance to Uncas.

At the next meeting of the commissioners, (July, 1647,) Winthrop was himself present, and presented a petition signed by sixty-two Indians "now dwelling at Namyok," entreating to be released from subjection to Uncas, and allowed to settle together in one place under the protection of the English. In the debate upon this petition, the whole conduct of Uncas was reviewed, and the court acknowledged that the outrage of the preceding summer had been too lightly treated by them. In addition to former complaints, it was stated that he had been more recently guilty of extensive depredations upon the Nipmucks, who had settled on the Quinebaug river, under the protection of the Massachusetts government,

The charge also of insolent bearing, and hostility toward the new settlement at Pequot was reiterated against the sachem. Winthrop stated, that Nowequa,¹ the brother of Uncas, had made a descent with his men upon the coast of Fisher's Island, destroyed a canoe and alarmed his people who were there. The same chief, on his return to Mohegan,

"Hovered around the English plantation in a suspicious manner, with forty or fifty of his men, many of them armed with guns, to the affrightment not only of the Indians on the shore (so that some of them began to bring their goods to the English houses) but divers of the English themselves."²

¹ The same as Waweequa or Waweekus.

^{5*}

² Hazard, vol. 2.

Foxon, the deputy of Uncas at this court, was a prudent and skillful counselor, esteemed by the natives "the wisest Indian in the country."¹ He used his utmost endeavors to exculpate the sachem from the various charges brought against him, but admitted the guilt of Waweequa, under whom, he said, and without the knowledge of Uncas, the hostile incursion had been made on the Nipmucks.

The court rebuked Uncas for his "sinful miscarriages," and amerced him in one hundred fathoms of wampum, but repeated the order that the Pequots should return to his sway and become amalgamated with his people :

" Yet they thought fit that the old men who were at Nam-e-oke before Mr. Winthrop's coming, should continue there, or be so provided for as may best suit the English at Pequot, but under subjection to Uncas as the rest."

The refusal of the court to comply with the earnest petition of the oppressed Nameaugs, may seem harsh at the present day. But it must be remembered that the Pequots were then a terror to the whole country. The very name caused an involuntary shuddering, or excited strong disgust. The commissioners excuse their decision by saying, that they had not forgotten "the proud wars some years since made by them, and the decree subsequently passed that they should not be suffered to retain their name, or be a distinct people."²

It can not be denied that in all controversies between the Mohegans and other Indian tribes, the colonial authorities were inclined to favor Uncas. This chief, by the destruction of his enemies, and the gratitude of the English, was daily rising into importance. The elder Winthrop counseled his son, to cultivate the friendship of a chief, whose proximity would render him an inconvenient enemy :

" I hear that Uncas is much at Connecticut, soliciting, &c. Seeing he is your neighbor, I would wish you not to be averse to reconciliation with him, if they of Connecticut desire it."³

Several years elapsed before these amicable relations were established. It is doubtful whether Mr. Winthrop and the sachem were ever cordial friends.

The decision of the commissioners that the Nameaugs should be amalgamated with the Mohegans was never carried into effect. The English planters countenanced them in throwing off the yoke, and

1 Letter of Elliot. Mass. His. Coll., 2d series, vol. 4, p. 57.

2 Hazard.

3 Letter of 1647. Savage's Winthrop.

boldly stood between them and their exasperated chief.¹ The decree was solemnly reenacted by the court in October, '48. "And it was now thought fit," says the record, "that Mr. John Winthrop be informed of the continued minds and resolutions of the commissioners for their return;" that in case Uncas should be obliged to enforce the order, he should not be opposed by him and his company, nor the Pequots sheltered by them. Again in July, '49, the commissioners uttered their testimony against the continued withdrawing of the Pequots from Uncas. The country at large could not allow the hated name to be perpetuated. Though some of the Nameaugs had never taken any part in the strife with the English, others had undoubtedly been numbered among the warriors of Sassacus, and some were even accused by the Mohegans of having been in the Mystic fort fight, and to have escaped under cover of the smoke. Those of the tribe that had taken part in the barbarous outrages committed at Saybrook and Wethersfield in 1636, were regarded with yet greater detestation.

So late as 1651, Major Mason and Thomas Stanton were commissioned by the General Court to make a rigid inquest whether any of those "murtherers of the English before the Pequett warres," could be found, that they might "be brought to condign punishment."

¹ Letter of R. Williams to Winthrop in Oct., 1648, notices "the outrageous carriage of Onkas among you."

CHAPTER IV.

Ancient Records.—**Early Regulations.**—**First Grantees.**—**First division of lands.**
Court orders for the Government.—**Enlargement of Bounds.**—**Indian trading house.**—**First Minister.**—**Earliest Births.**

THE earliest records of the town were made in a loosely stitched book, which is now in a fragmentary state. Some succeeding scribe has labeled it “The Antientest Book, for 1648, 49, 50,”—but a few fragments are found in it dated yet earlier,—in 1646 and '7.

Who was the clerk or recorder of this old book is not ascertained. He uses the orthography, Hempstead, Lothrop, Winthrop, Isarke Willie, Minor, &c. Instances of provincialism in employing and omitting the aspirate occur, as *huse* for use; *eavy* for heavy. The two Winthrops, John and Deane, are uniformly entitled Mr., as are also Jonathan Brewster and Robert Parke, when they appear in the plantation; but all others are styled Goodman, or mentioned by Christian and surname, without any prefix.

The public officers at this time were one constable, five townsmen, among whom Winthrop held a paramount authority, two fence-viewers and clearers of highways, and two overseers of wears. The annual meeting was held on the last Thursday in February. The legal or dating year began on the 25th of March. Subsequently, though not in this oldest book, the double date was used between the 25th of February and 25th of March. In one end of the book was kept the account of town meetings and regulations made by the inhabitants, or by the townsmen, and in the other, (the book being turned,) a record of house-lots and other grants.

That which appears to be the oldest remaining page of this “Antientest Book,” and consequently the oldest fragment of record extant in the town, begins with No. 13 of a series of by-laws; the first twelve being lost. It is dated July, the year gone, but we learn from the dates following that it was 1646.

13. "It is agreed by the inhabitants of Nameeug¹ that the land lying between the oxe pasture at the end of the field by John Robinsons and so between the highway and the great river along to alewife brooke² shall be for a coren [corn] field for the use of the town to make a generall filde.

"The 17 of Desember William Mortons meadow was recorded and the same day Robert Hempsteeds plot by the cove 2 pole."

The ox-pasture was on the river, north of Winthrop's Neck. The fencing of this pasture, to receive the cattle of the planters, and the building of a bridge over the brook at the north end of the town plot, were probably some of the first preparatory steps toward the settlement.

The next regulations are unimportant; relating to trespasses of cattle and laying out of lots.

"John Stubens and Robert Hempsted are chosen to view the fences for this year, [1647.]"

"25 of februarrie 1647, [1648, New Style.]

"The inhabitants of Nameeug did chuse with a joyn特 consent Mr. John winthrop, Robert hempsted, Samuell lothrop, Isarke willie and Thomas Minor to set in all Towne affaires as the other fower did the last yeare with Mr. John winthrop having the same power as he did have the last yeare only no planting groande must be granted or laid out for this yeare but in the generall coren [corn] field at foxens hill³ the other side of the great river⁴ we may lay out, by lot only must it be laid out.

"the same day Isarke willie was granted by the said inhabitants to have a planting lot at the other side of the cove by Mr. deane winthrops lot.

"It is ordered the 2 of march [1648] whosoever from this time forward shall take up any lot that if he com not in six months time to inhabit his lot shall be forfite to the Towne—and further it is agreed that no prsons or pson [person] shall have admittance into the Towne of Nameeug there to be an inhabitant except the pties or ptie [party] shall bring some testimonie from the magistrates or Elders of the place that they com from or from some neighbor plantations and some good Christian, what their carriage is or have been."

This last order has a line drawn over it as expunged. It was prob-

¹ This rugged Indian name is the only one used in the records to designate the plantation till 1649.

² Alewife Brook, three miles north of the town plot, a stream flowing into what is now called Bolles Cove. On the Great Neck, south-west of the town, were another stream and cove, bearing the same name, and still retaining it.

³ Foxen's Hill was that beautiful ridge of land on the west side of the river, north of the town plot, where is now the mansion of Capt. Lyman Allyn, with the Congdon place, and the farms of the Messrs. Bolles.

⁴ Great River, or Great River of Pequot is the name uniformly given in the early records, to the river opposite the town, while farther up the stream, it was invariably called Mohegan River.

ably proposed, but not sanctioned by a majority. No such stringent law in regard to inhabitancy was ever in operation. The following regulation of the same date, would be regarded at the present day as sufficiently exacting and arbitrary.

" It is agreed by the inhabitants that any man being lawfully warned to appear at any generall towne meeting, that refuse, or that do not com at the time appoynted, or within half an houre of the apointed time, if he be at home, or have notice of the citation, that man shall pay to the constabell two shillings and six pence for the use of the towne, or if any person do voate after the companie be com to voate, or before the meeting be ended, without the companies leave, that partie shall likewise pay two shillings and six pence for his disorder; and further it is agreed that if any failes in either of these two thinges before mentioned, and refuse to pay the penaltie, when the constabell demandes it, the constabell shall have power to distraine.

" March, 1648. It is agreed if any person do kill any wolfe or wolfs within the town of Nameeug, he that kills the wolf shall have of everie familie in towne six pence conditionaly that he bring the head and the skin to any two of the townsmen.

" The 16 of Januarie, 1648. [1649.]

" It is agreed by the townsmen of Nameeug that Mr. John winthroup is granted to set up a were and to make huse of the river at poquanuck¹ at the uper end of the plaine for to take fish and so to make improvement of it, to him and his heires and asings.

" The 17 of februarie, 1648. The meadow that Robert hempsted did formerly mow liing by quittapeage Rocke² is granted to Andrew loungdon and giles smith from the great Rock at the north end and so to hould in breadth of the pon as far towards the plombeech as any was mowed by Robert hempsted."

Young as the township was, we find that this last extract reverts to what had *formerly* been done. This and other similar references add strength to the intimations given that a band of planters was here as early as 1645, making preparations for a permanent settlement.

It will be observed that in the record of the next annual meeting the formula is varied; the name *Nameeug* is dropped and apparently no more authority is given to Winthrop than to the other townsmen.

" 22 Feb. 1648, [749.] The inhabitants of Pequit plantation have chosen by a joynt consent Mr. John Winthroup, Robert Hempsted, Carie Latham, John

1 Poquanuck is the name of a small stream which runs south through Groton and enters a cove or creek of the Sound, about two miles east of the Thames. The name is also applied to the village and plain in its vicinity, but is now generally written Pequonuck. The aboriginal name of Windsor and of a part of Stratford was similar.

2 Quittapeag Rock, may have given name to what are now known as Quinnapeag Rocks, on the west side of the river's mouth, but the former must have stood farther in upon the shore. Quittapeag was either the Light-House ledge or Long Rock, half a mile south-west of the Light-House.

Stubens and Thomas Minor for this yeare following to act in all towne affaires as well in the disposing of lands as in other prudentiall occasions for the towne.

"The same day the inhabitants did consent and desier that the plantation may be called London."

It was proposed also that in the records the town should be styled "Pequit plantation or London," joining the two together.

Thus early did the inhabitants select their name ; fixing upon the one, which of all others should be most generally suggestive of the far-off home they had left behind. To this choice they faithfully adhered through many discouragements. The General Court demurred at their favorite name, declined to sanction it, and as we shall see suggested another, which the inhabitants refused to adopt. The Indian names therefore continued to be used in the records, though we may readily suppose that the chosen designation of the planters came into colloquial use, and that the growing settlement was soon known in the abbreviated style of the olden time, as Lon'on town or New Lon'on.

Other regulations made in '48 and '49, are not of sufficient interest to be given at large. They relate to the marking of cattle;—the impounding of cattle and swine, and the disposition to be made of strays,—the order in which the owners of cattle were by turns to relieve the cow-keeper on the Sabbath,—the laying out of highways east of the river, and the penalty attached to taking away another person's canoe, when fastened to the shore. The cattle of the inhabitants, the swine, the corn-fields, the salt marsh, and the wears, were evidently their principal pecuniary concerns. Waterhouse and Stubens were chosen overseers of the wears for the year '49.

We turn now to the record of house-lots, and the names of the first planters. It is plain that no grants had been recorded before 1647, but many of the planters were before this in actual possession of lots. When therefore, they were confirmed and registered, reference was occasionally made to the fence that inclosed the lot, or the house built upon it.

The home-lots were originally numbered up to thirty-eight ; but erasures and alterations were made, reducing the names of grantees to thirty-six ; of these, the first six are missing, and several of the remainder are partially erased, but by comparison with subsequent records, the whole thirty-six can be ascertained.

1. John Winthrop, Esq., whose home-lot was undoubtedly selected by himself before all others : it covered the *Neck* still known by his name. The next five were probably John Gager, Cary Latham,

Samuel Lothrop, John Stebbins, and Isaac Willey, whose homesteads lay north-west of Mr. Winthrop's, on the upper part of what are now Williams Street and Main Street.

"7. Jacob Waterhouse is granted by a general voate and joyn't consent of the townsmen of Nameeug to have six ackers for an house lot next to John Stubbens, be it more or less."

Such is the style of all the house-lot grants: a parcel of meadow,¹ and of upland, at a distance from the home-lot is added to each.

8. Thomas Miner; 9. William Bordman; 10. William Morton. These three were in the south-west part of the town-plot, between Bream and Close Coves, covering what is now known as Shaw's Neck. Miner's lot was one of the earliest taken up in the plantation. Bordman in a short time sold out to Morton, and left the place.²

After these are William Nicholls, Robert Hempstead, whose lot is said to lie "on the north side of his house between two little fresh streams," Thomas Skidmore, John Lewis, Richard Post, Robert Bedell, John Robinson, Deane Winthrop, William Bartlett, (on the cove called Close Cove; this lot is dated in the margin 15 Oct., 1647;) Nathaniel Watson, John Austin, William Forbes, Edward Higbie, Jarvis Mudge, Andrew Longdon; ("at the top of the hill called Meeting-house Hill, by a little run of fresh water;") William Hallett, Giles Smith, Peter Busbraw, James Bemis, John Fossecar, Consider Wood, George Chappell. After these the grants are recorded in a different hand, and are of later date. Mr. Jonathan Brewster, Oct. 5th, 1649. Thomas Wells, Peter Blatchford, Nathaniel Masters, all dated Feb. 16, '49-50.

In the above list of grants, those which are crossed, or indorsed as forfeited, are, Watson, Austin, Higbie, Mudge, Hallet, Smith, Busbraw, Fossecar, Wood, Chappell. Mudge and Chappell, however, settled in the town a little later.

The list of cattle-marks in the writing of this first clerk, that is, before 1650, furnishes but sixteen names, viz., Winthrop, Morton,

1 The "salt meadow on Mamaquacke" was added in portions of two acres each to the house-lot grants, as far as it went. A marsh called Spring meadow was exhausted in the same way. Mamaquack, or as written afterward, Mamacock, was the neck of land on which Fort Trumbull is situated. A neck of land two miles up the river bore the same name.

2 A William Boardman died a few years later at Guilford, leaving no issue. He was probably the same person. [Judd, MS.]

Waterhouse, Stebbins, Willey, Nicholls, Skidmore, Lothrop, Bedell, Latham, Lewis, Hempstead, Bordman, Gager, Miner, Bartlett. That of Mr. Brewster is next added.

Preparatory to a division of lands on the east side of the river, two grants are recorded to Mr. Winthrop, who was allowed a first choice of his portion, while the other shares went by lot. The first is a farm of princely dimensions at Poquonuck, and the other a lot on the river. The lands in these situations, on the Sound and on the river, being those which the inhabitants could immediately make available, were the first divided. The upland on the river furnished planting fields, and the Poquonuck plains, meadow and grass land.

Winthrop's farm embraced a tract about three miles in length from north to south, averaging perhaps a mile in breadth, lying between Poquonuck Creek or River and what was then called East or Straight Cove, (since known as Mumford's Cove.) On the south it was washed by the Sound and intersected by inlets of salt water. In this compass were all the varieties of forest and meadow, arable land, pasture and salt marsh, which are useful to the farmer, and pleasing to the eye of taste. It lay also in an opposite position to Winthrop's island farm, so that the owner of these two noble domains could look over Fisher's Island Sound, from either side, and rest his eye on his own fair possessions.

Winthrop's grant on the east bank of the river was "right against the sandy point of his own home lot, the length eight score pole and the breadth eight score pole;" that is, on Groton bank, opposite the eastern spur of Winthrop's Neck. These grants being settled, the other planters drew lots for their shares on the 17th and 31st of January, 1648-9. From these lists we obtain two catalogues of those who may be considered as first comers.

"A division of lands on the east side of the Great River of Pequot, north of Mr. Winthrop's lot."

The list contains but eighteen names: the shares were of twenty, thirty and forty acres. The division of Poquonuck plain was in lots of the same average size, and the number of grantees twenty-two, viz., Austin, Bartlett, Bedell, Bemas, Bordman, Bussbraw, Fossicker, Gager, Hallet, Hempstead, Latham, Lewis, Longdon, Lothrop, Miner, Morton, Nicholls, Robinson, Smith, Stebbins, Waterhouse, Willey. These were undoubtedly all actual residents of the town plot at that time, and expecting to cultivate the land the next season; but Austin, Bordman, Bussbraw, Hallet, Robinson and Smith soon

disappeared from the plantation, forfeiting or selling their grants. Deane Winthrop, after a short residence with his brother, returned to Boston, and is no further connected with our history. It is no matter of surprise that a portion of the planters determined to look further for a more favorable position. The sterile soil, yielding but a scanty return in proportion to the labor required for its cultivation, must have discouraged many, who were expecting to gain a livelihood by husbandry.

The first house lots were laid out chiefly at the two extremities of the semicircular projection which formed the site of the town. Between these, were thick swamps, waving woods, ledges of rock, and ponds of water. The oldest communication from one to the other, was from Mill Brook over Post Hill,—so called from Richard Post, whose house lot was on this hill,—through what is now William St. to Manwaring's Hill, and down Blackhall St. to Truman St. and the Harbor's Mouth Road. Main St. was opened, and from thence a cut over the hill westward was made, (now Richards and Granite Sts.) Bank St. was laid out on the very brink of the upland, above the sandy shore, and a spur (now Coit St.) was carried around the head of Bream Cove to Truman St., completing the circuit of the town plot. No names were given to any of the streets for at least a century after the settlement; save that Main St. was uniformly called the Town St. and Bank St. the Bank. Hempstead St. was one of the first laid out, and a pathway coincident with the present State St. led from the end of the Town St., west and north-west, to meet it. Such appears to have been the original plan of the town. The cove at the north was Mill Cove; the two coves at the south, Bream and Close. Water St. was the Beach, and the head of it at the entrance of Mill Cove, was Sandy Point.

The streams were larger than at present. Mill and Truman's Brooks were called little *rivers*. A considerable stream¹ crossed the Town St., (above the intersection of Church St.,) and flowing east and north-east ran into the cove not far from Federal St. A rivulet, meandering from Manwaring's Hill, along the side of Robert Hempstead's lot into Bream Cove, was called Vine Brook. Small gushing rills of pure water were numerous; and ponds and miry thickets, from whence the shrill-voiced frogs announced approaching spring, were freely scattered over the surface of the town plot.

1 Afterward called Solomon's Brook, from Solomon Coit, through whose garden it flowed.

The earliest houses were undoubtedly built of timber that grew on or near the spot where they stood. Along Mill Cove some large trees were left standing;¹ the hill-side, sloping from the summit to the water, was probably at the time of the settlement a dense wood-lot, very rugged and in some parts precipitous and rocky. It seems to have been Winthrop's original design, that a meeting-house should be built on this height, and therefore from the first, the whole ridge lying between the present First and Second Burial-Grounds, was called Meeting-house Hill.

Near the center of the town plot was a prominent ledge of granite, lying north and south, (near Union St.,) which was left for a century and a half in its native condition, forming a kind of background to the eastern portion of the town, with only here and there a house west of it. This ledge is now in the crowded part of the city, having all its projecting and rugged points lowered, or entirely blasted away, and wearing a beautiful crown of churches.²

Nothing appears on the town books from first to last, relative to the contending claims of Massachusetts and Connecticut for the jurisdiction of the place. No one would even conjecture, from any thing recorded here, that the right of the latter colony was ever called in question. After the decision of the commissioners in July, '47, in favor of Connecticut, the jurisdiction was quietly conceded to her.

An order of the General Court, Sept. 9th, 1647, intimates that the question of jurisdiction is at rest.

“The Court thinks meet that a Commission be directed to Mr. Wynthrop to execute justice according to our lawes and the rule of righteousnes.”

This commission was renewed the next year, and Winthrop continued in the magistracy until chosen to higher office in the colony.

At the session of the General Court in May, 1649, the following regulations were made respecting Pequot:

1. The inhabitants were exempted from all public country charges, i. e., taxes for the support of the colonial government, for the space of three years ensuing.

2. The bounds of the plantation were restricted to four miles each side of the

¹ These particulars are gathered from the descriptions of grants, bound-marks, and old deeds.

² The First Congregational Church, the old Methodist, and two Baptist Churches are on this ledge.

river, and six miles from the sea northward into the country, " till the court shall see cause and have encouragement to add therunto, provided they entertain none amongst them as inhabitants that shall be obnoxious to this jurisdiction, and that the aforesaid bounds be not distributed to less than forty families."

3. John Winthrop, Esq., with Thomas Miner and Samuel Lothrop as assistants, were to have power as a court to decide all differences among the inhabitants under the value of forty shillings.

3. Uncas and his tribe were prohibited from setting any traps, but not from hunting and fishing within the bounds of the plantation.

5. The inhabitants were not allowed to monopolize the corn trade with the Indians in the river; which trade was to be left free to all in the united colonies.

6. " The Courte commends the name of Faire Harbour to them for to bee the name of theire Towne."

7. Thomas Miner was appointed " Military Sergeant in the Towne of Pequett," with power to call forth and train the inhabitants.

At the same session, orders were issued with respect to certain individuals at Pequot, viz., Robert Bedell, Cary Latham and Isaac Willey, charged with resisting a constable, and letting go an Indian committed to their charge; " one Hallett," accused of living with another man's wife; and Mary Barnes,¹ whose offense is not specified; all of whom were summoned to appear at Hartford and answer for their conduct. The inspection of the General Court at that period apparently extended to every household, and took cognizance of the character and conduct of every individual within their jurisdiction.

William Hallett about this period, and probably in consequence of the warrant against him from the court, forfeited his grants and left the plantation.

In May, 1650, the General Court added to the bounds of the town two miles from the sea northward; and a year later extended the western boundary to Bride Brook, where it had been at first marked out by Winthrop. This grant, with the condition annexed, was in the following terms :

"Act of Assembly, May 15, 1651.

" This Court taking into consideration the proposition of the inhabitants of Pequot for some enlargement of meadowe at Naihanticot and whereas there was 500 ackers of ground lying in Pequot granted to five of Captin Mason's soouldiers at the Pequoott warr, wch being taken up by Pequot they doe desire may be recompensed at Naihanticot : the Court desires and appoynts John

1 This person has not been further traced.

Clarke and Thomas Berchard of Seabrooke shoudl goe to Pequot and vewe the said parcell of land there given to the souldiers and taken up by Pequot as before, and then goe to Naihanticot and lay out there unto the said souldiers such and soe much land, as may be fully equivalent to there former grant of land at Pequot.

"And for the inhabitants of Pequoet the Court grants that there bounds shall come to Bride Brook, (the former grant excepted) provided that it doth not come within the bounds of Seabrooke, and provided that what meadowe or marsh there is above 200 ackers it shall be reserved for the Countries use and for there dispose."¹

The above named grant was laid out to Lieut. Thomas Bull and four others of Mason's soldiers. The town record says, "the land given to Lieutenant Bull and other well deserving soldiers, lies at a place called Sargent's Head, on the west side of Nahantick Bay."

The next election of town officers, which was probably the fourth regular annual election, is recorded in a different hand from the previous records, and varies from them in orthography.

"At a town meeting at Namearke,² the 25th of Feb. 1649 ['50] these sower men chosen for townesmen.

Mr. John Winthrop,
Mr. Johnnathan Brewster,
Robert Hempstead,
William Nicholls.

"At the same meeting John Stubbines is chosen Constable for the towne Namearke."

Mr. Brewster must have been chosen clerk or recorder about the same time. The succeeding records of that year are in his hand, and he adds to his signature "Clarke of the Towne of Pequett." His business as an Indian trader, kept him much abroad, and he held the office but one year.

Winthrop and Brewster were made freemen of Connecticut colony, in May, 1650. In September of that year Mr. Brewster and Thomas Miner appeared at the General Court as the first deputies from Pequot.

The first town grants to Brewster were in September, '49. He established a trading-house with the Mohegans, at a point on the

¹ See Col. Rec. of Conn., p. 221. The text is copied from New London Town Book, No. 1, p. 89. The only variations from the colonial record are in the spelling: the latter has Niantecutt, Pequett; the town copy, Naihanticot, Pequot.

² In the orthography of Indian names some clerks made use of k, where others employed g. Thus, one class wrote Nameeug, Mohegan or Monhegun, Massapeag, Nipmug, and another Nameark or Namy-ok, Mauhekon, Massapeak, Neepmook.

east side of the river opposite to their principal settlement. At this place which is still called by his name, Brewster's Neck, he laid out for himself a large farm. The deed of the land was given him by Uncas, in substance as follows:¹

“April 25, 1650. I, Unquas, Sachem of Mauhekon, doe give freely unto Jonathan Brewster of Pequett, a tract of land, being a plaine of arable land, bounded on the south side with a great Coave called Poccattannoc ke, on the north with the old Poccatuck path that goes to the Trading Coave, &c. For, and in consideration thereof, the said J. B. binds himself and his heirs to keep a house for trading goods with the Indians.”

[Signed by the Sachem and witnessed by William Baker and John Fosquier.]

This deed was confirmed by the town, Nov. 30th, 1652, and its bounds determined. It comprised the whole neck on which the trading-house stood, “450 acres laid out by the measurers.”²

The General Court in May, 1650, censured Mr. Brewster for the steps he had taken in establishing this trade.

“Whereas Mr. Jonathan Brewster hath set up a trading house at Mohegan, this Court declares that they cannot but judge the thing very disorderly, nevertheless considering his condition, they are content he should proceed therein for the present and till they see cause to the contrary.”³

On the 10th of Nov., 1650, a town meeting was held to arrange a system of co-operation with Mr. Winthrop, in establishing a mill to grind corn. Sixteen persons were said to be present, though only fifteen are enumerated, viz.

Mr. Winthrop, Mr. Parke, Jonathan Brewster, Robert Hempsted, William Nicholls, John Gager, Thomas Stanton, William Bartlett, Peter Blatchford, William Comstock, William Taylor, Mr. Blinman, Samuel Lothrop, John Lewis, William Morton.

The establishment of a mill was an object of prime importance. It was decided that the inhabitants should be at the charge of “making the dam and heavy work belonging to the milne;” six men were

1 New London Deeds.

2 Actually, 600 or 700. It was subsequently left to Mr. Brewster's option to have his farm included within the bounds of New London or of Norwich. He chose to belong to the latter.

3 Colonial Records, p. 209.

Mr. Brewster had been previously engaged in trading along the coast from New England to Virginie, and had met with losses. When he came to Pequot his Bay creditors had stripped him of his estate. This explains the reference of the Court to his condition. See Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 9, p. 281.

selected to perform the work, and make it substantial and sufficient, (to be paid two shillings per day,) and six others were to rate the town, to defray the charge.

“ Further, it is agreed that no person or persons shall set up any other milne to grind corn for the town of Pequett within the limits of the town either for the present, nor for the future, so long as Mr. John Winthrop or his heirs, do uphold a milne to grind the town corn.”

A considerable addition was made to the number of grantees during the year 1650. Robert Parke and his son Thomas had resided for several years in Wethersfield, from which place the former was deputy to the General Court in 1641 and '42. They came to the Pequot plantation in the spring of 1650. Mr. Parke purchased the house lot of Mr. Brewster, with its improvements, on Meeting-house Hill, (corner of Granite and Hempstead Sts.) Mr. Brewster received a new lot from the town, (which better accommodated him as an Indian trader,) at the lower end of the bank, south of the present Tilley St. It was long afterward known as the Picket lot. Robert Burrows removed from Wethersfield, about the same time with the Parkes. His first grant is dated June 2. He had a house lot in the southern part of the town, but appears to have settled at Poquonock that year or the next. Grants were also made during the summer to Richard Belden, Philip Kerwithy, (Carwithy,) Samuel Martin and William Taylor, but they proved to be transient inhabitants. Taylor remained till 1653; the others forfeited their grants.

On the 19th of October, 1650, grants were made by the townsmen to

“ Mr. Blynman, Obadiah Bruen, Hughe Caukin, Hughe Roberts, John Coite, Andrew Lester, James Averye, Robert Isbell.”

These were all from Gloucester, a town on the eastern coast of Massachusetts, situated upon the peninsula of Cape Ann. Mr. Richard Blinman had been the minister of Gloucester, for eight years, and was now engaged to become the minister of the Pequot plantation. The others were a party of his friends, who purposed to remove with him, and came on to make preparatory arrangements. William Keeny, Ralph Parker, William Wellman, Robert Brookes, Thomas Stanton and John Elderkin,¹ all had grants of nearly the

¹ One of the grants to Elderkin was “ four acres of upland on the neck by the English house.” This is supposed to refer to the ruins of the building erected by the Mas-

same date, and the three first named probably belonged also to the Cape Ann party.

Thomas Stanton's house lot consisted of six acres on the Bank, north-east of Brewster's. This locality might be now designated as fronting on Bank Street, north of Tilley, and extending back to Methodist Street. He sold it in 1657 to George Tongue. Robert Brookes had a house lot given him, but forfeited it.

Before the end of the municipal year, Feb. 25th, 1650-1, we find the names of George Chappell, William Comstock, Thomas Doxey, John Gallop, Thomas Hungerford, Mrs. Lake, Captain Sybada, Edward Scott, Edward Stallion, Thomas Stedman, and Matthew Waller, all applicants for house lots.

Kempo Sybada, the Dutch captain, was accommodated with a lot fronting on Mill Cove, the town street running through it, and extending west to the present Huntington Street. In later times it was Shapley property, and Shapley Street was cut through it. Next south was Thomas Doxey's lot, reaching to the present Federal Street, and still farther south the lots of Edward Stallion and Thomas Bayley, (Bailey,) extending nearly to State Street. Bayley's lot of three acres was granted in August, 1651. West of Stallion and Bayley, was Peter Blatchford's lot, that had been laid out the previous year and was estimated at eight acres, but much encumbered with swamp and rock. Church Street now intersects this large lot, which had its front on State Street, extending east and west from Union to Meridian Streets.

On the town street, east of Stallion and Bayley, a lot of ample dimensions was laid out to John Gallop, eight acres in the very heart of the town, covering the space east of the town street to the beach, and extending north from State Street to Federal.

George Chappell's lot, granted Feb. 20th, 1651-2, was afterward the Manwaring homestead, on Manwaring's Hill.

William Comstock's location was on Post Hill, near the present corner of Vauxhall and Williams Streets. Mrs. Lake and John Elderkin had a lot of eight acres divided between them, next south of Comstock. The dividing line between them was directly opposite the intersection of the highway now called Granite Street. South of

sachusetts forces as related in Chapter I. It is never referred to in such a manner as to designate its locality. But it seems to have been near the town plot, and on a neck. Winthrop's Neck was engrossed by his house lot. Where could it have been, if not on the upland part of Mamacock, i. e. where Fort Trumbull now stands?

them, near the intersection of the present Broad Street, was Matthew Waller. This elevated neighborhood was called Waller's Hill. Thomas Hungerford had a lot on the Bank, next above Stanton's. Edward Scott and Thomas Stedman forfeited their grants, though at a period fifteen years later, Stedman, or another person of the same name, became an inhabitant.

Trumbull, in the History of Connecticut, treating of the plantation at Pequot, places the removal of Mr. Blinman under 1648 :

" This year Mr. Richard Blinman, who had been a minister in England, removed from Gloucester to the new settlement; in consequence of which a considerable addition was made to the numbers who had kept their station."

This date is too early. A comparison of the records of Gloucester with those of New London shows that he did not remove till 1650. The records of neither place afford us any clue to the causes which led to this change of abode. No disagreement of Mr. Blinman with his parishioners at Gloucester is mentioned. Ecclesiastical dissensions, however, existed in the colony, from which he may have wished to escape. He appears to have been desirous also, of living near to some settlement of the natives, in order to devote a part of his time to their instruction.

The original contract of the town with Mr. Blinman has not been preserved; but from subsequent references it appears that a committee had been sent to confer with him, who had pledged liberal accommodations of land, with a salary of £60 *per annum*, which was to be enlarged as the ability of the town increased. A house lot of six acres, on Meeting-House Hill, was confirmed to him Dec. 20th, 1650, "three acres whereof, (says the record,) were given by the town's agents, as appears in the articles, and the other three by a public town meeting." This house lot covered some of the highest land in the town plot and was directly north of that of Mr. Parke. Described by modern boundaries, it occupied the space between the old burial-ground and Williams Street, along the north side of Granite Street. The town built his house for him, as appears from various references and charges respecting it, but on what part of the lot it stood is uncertain.¹

The whole eastern or Cape Ann company that proposed removing with Mr. Blinman, could not have been less than twenty families.

¹ If conjecture might be allowed, we should fix the site on the slope of the hill upon the north-west side, nearly opposite Richard Post's lot, where is yet remaining an ancient well on the street side.

Nearly this number of planters came on the next spring, but some of them merely to explore and view the country. Perhaps a dozen brought with them their families, cattle and goods, and became permanent inhabitants. Several of these are supposed to have been members of Mr. Blinman's church at Chepstowe, in Monmouthshire, England, before his ejection. They had accompanied him over the ocean, had kept with him at Marshfield and at Gloucester, and now followed his fortunes to the shore of the Sound. They were farmers and mechanics, who had found Gloucester, which was then little more than a fishing station, an unfavorable place for their occupations, and hoped by coming further south to meet with a less sterile soil and a fairer field for enterprise. It was certainly an object for the faithful pastor and his tried friends to keep together, and as Pequot was without a minister and casting about to obtain one, the arrangement was an agreeable one on all sides. The settlement of the Parkes in the plantation was also very probably linked with the removal of Mr. Blinman, he being connected with them by family ties.¹

In March, 1651, the principal body of these eastern emigrants arrived; in addition to those already named, John Coite the younger, William Hough, Thomas Jones, Edmund Marshall and his son John, William Meades and James Morgan, belonged to the same company. With them came also Robert Allyn, from Salem, and Philip Taber, from "Martin's Vineyard." The plantation at this period was a place of considerable resort, and a number of persons enrolled their names and obtained grants, whose wavering purposes soon carried them elsewhere. The younger Coite, the two Marshalls, and Thomas Jones, after a short residence, returned to Gloucester. Philip Taber commenced building a house on Foxen's Hill, which he never occupied or completed. It was sold by his brother-in-law Cary Latham, in 1653.

Several other persons also appear among the grantees or planters of the town at this flood time of increase, but no certain date can be given for their arrival. These are Matthew Beckwith, the Beeby brothers, (John, Samuel and Thomas,) Peter Collins, George Harwood, Richard Poole and John Packer. Samuel Beeby, and perhaps John, had been for some time in the plantation, in the service

¹ It is probable that Mr. Blinman's wife Mary, and Dorothy, wife of Thomas Parke, were sisters. In various deeds and covenants on record, Mr. Blinman calls Thomas Parke his brother; and in a deed of 1658, he conveys land which he says "I had of my brother-in-law Thomas Parke."

of Mr. Winthrop. Thomas is supposed to have come with the eastern company. All had house lots given them in the spring of 1651.

Next to Mr. Blinman, the person of most note in the Cape Ann company, was Obadiah Bruen. He had been recorder and one of the townsmen of Gloucester for several years, and in transferring his residence seems to have taken his pen and his official duty with him. His latest registration in Gloucester was made in December, and the succeeding February he was recorder and one of the townsmen of Pequot. The house lot accorded to him was on Meeting-House Hill, and covered a considerable part of what is now the town square, leaving only narrow highways on the north and west, and extending south to the present Broad Street. Portions of it were afterward given up to the town, by himself and subsequent owners. He sold it in 1653 to William Hough.

Early in 1651, New Street, in the rear of the town plot, was opened for the accommodation of the Cape Ann company. This position was designated as "beyond the brook and the ministry lot." It was carved into house lots and took the name of Cape Ann Lane. The lots on this street were nine in number, of six acres each, extending both sides of the narrow street, from the alder swamp in front to Cedar Swamp on the west. Beginning at the lower end, Hugh Calkins had the first lot by the Lyme road, or highway to Nahantick, as it was then called, and next him was his son-in-law Hugh Roberts; then Coite, Lester, Avery, Allyn, Meades, Hough, Isbell. The Beebys and Marshalls were yet farther north. James Morgan was "on the path to New Street," (i. e., Ashcraft Street.) William Keeny was nearly opposite the south entrance to New Street, on the Nahantick road. Parker was next below him, at the head of Close Cove, and Wellman on the same cove, south-east of Parker. Wellman and Coite, however exchanged lots: the latter was a ship-carpenter and wished to be near the water, where he could be accommodated with a building yard.

The house lots accorded to the new comers were mostly in the rear of the town plot, where the position was inconvenient and dreary, and the soil hard to cultivate. Many were discouraged and went away, who would perhaps have remained, had their home lots been more inviting. These remarks particularly apply to that series of home lots laid out at this time through New Street and northward of it. Even those who had the courage to settle down in this part of the plantation, soon abandoned the land to pasturage or waste, and found other homesteads. It is but recently that this quarter of the town has resumed some importance. Cape Ann and Lewis Lanes,

after nearly two hundred years of desolation, are beginning once more to be peopled and cultivated.

EARLIEST BIRTHS.

"Mary, daughter of Robert Hempstead, was born 26 March, 1647."

This is supposed to be the first birth after the settlement. It is not recorded in the town book, but is taken from the will of Robert Hempstead, at the close of which is an indorsement of the births of all his children, certified by himself. No birth anterior to this date can be ascertained; and the uniform current of tradition gives to this the priority. Joshua Hempstead, great-grandson of Robert, in a memorandum made in his diary about seventy years after the settlement, stated that the above-named Mary Hempstead was the first born of English parents in New London.

Robert Hempstead may also have been the first person married in the settlement. The above-named Mary was his oldest child. His wife Joanna is supposed to have been a daughter of Isaac and Joanna Willie. Winthrop was undoubtedly the officiating magistrate, in the earliest marriages, but no record of any marriage by him, or incidental notice of any other than the one at Bride Brook, has come down to us.

It should be noticed that in the town registry of births there are several which bear an earlier date than that of Mary Hempstead; but on a close investigation, it will be found that these took place in other towns. The registry entitled "Births in New London," begins with the following record:

"Hannah, the daughter of James Avery, was born 11 Oct. 1644.

"James, the son of do.—1st Dec. 1646.

"Mary, the daughter of do.—19 Feb. 1647."

Yet James Avery did not settle in the place till 1651, and upon examination of the records of Gloucester, Mass., from whence he removed, we find the births of these children recorded there. This is not a solitary instance of loose and inaccurate registry, calculated to mislead inquirers.

Next after Mary Hempstead, and the first-born male of New London, was Manasseh, son of Thomas and Grace Miner, born April 28th, 1647. Nor can we find any other births recorded earlier than the next two children of Thomas Miner. But we know from other authority, that Winthrop's daughter Martha¹ was born here in July or August, 1648. Other births, also, may have taken place, of which the record, if any were made, is lost.

¹ Savage's Winthrop, vol. 2, app., p. 355.

CHAPTER V.

New Recorder and Moderator.—Extracts from the Moderator's Memorandum Books, with a running commentary.—Grants, Grantees and Town Affairs, 1651—1661.

FEB. 25th, 1650 [51.] The four townsmen chosen were Messrs. Winthrop, Stebbins, R. Parke and Bruen. This was the last year in which Winthrop acted in that capacity, though he continued to be consulted in all important affairs. His duties as an assistant of the colony, and his various private undertakings, in setting up mills and forges, and his large trading and farming operations, sufficiently account for his retiring, in a great measure, from town concerns.

At the same annual election of town officers, a very important appointment was made.

"By a generall consent Obadiah Bruen was chosen Recorder of the towne of Pequot."

Mr. Bruen continued in this office without interruption for sixteen years, and was usually moderator of the town meetings; so that scarcely any record of deeds, votes, choice of officers, accounts, bills of lading, or copies of legislative acts, can be found belonging to that period, in any other handwriting than his. Ten years after this appointment, a resolution was adopted by the five townsmen, which shows a laudable desire to preserve the public documents, and as it relates to the matter now in hand, it may be copied here, though not in the order of time.

" Feb. 6, 1660.

" For the settling perfecting and fairly recording of all records, for the town's use and good of after posterity, wee agreed that there shall be a towne booke, with an Alphabet in it, wherein all acts passed, orders or agreements, shall hereafter be fairly recorded, whether past or to come, for the effecting hereof, we agreed that all the old bookees of records shall be searched into for what is material concerning the public good, to be drawn out into a booke provided

and paid for by the Recorder, who shall have 6d. paid him out of the town rate for every act, law or order recorded."

[Signed by the townsmen, Obadiah Bruen, Hugh Calkin, James Rogers, James Avery, William Nichols.]

"The old bookes of records" were those sheets which furnished matter for the foregoing chapter, and several subsequent small memorandum books kept by the moderators and town-clerk. Extracts from these were now engrossed into a larger book, which is labeled "Town Book No. 1, Letter E." Those regulations which continued in force, and other items important to the well-being of the town, were transferred to the new book, but not in regular order, and sometimes strangely intermixed with the current affairs of the period when the copy was made. Grants were copied and registered with more precise bounds, in a book by themselves, which is referred to as the "old book under Mr. Brewster;" the registration having been commenced by him.

Fortunately, a part of the series of memorandum books from which the extracts were made, remain, though in a fragmentary state and sometimes illegible. But even in this state, they are of far greater value than the subsequent copy. They are more ample and minute in detail, and being made by the clerk upon the spot, they bring us nearer to the scene and make the picture more vivid. These brief jottings down, therefore, will be followed as far as they go. Their suggestive tendency and the bold outlines they sketch, will more than compensate for breaking the regular course of historical narrative. Such explanations as may render them intelligible will be interwoven.

The earliest minute in Mr. Bruen's hand is on a scrap of paper, apparently part of the first leaf of a memorandum book. It is dated July, 1651, and affords a full list of the actual inhabitants at that time.

"The names of all y^t wrought at the Mill Dam.

Kary Latham	Taylor
Jn ^o Gallope	Willey
Jn ^o Gager	Hanshut
Thom. Parke	Tabor
Jn ^o Stubbin	Waterhouse half a day.
Longdon	Comstock
Mynor	Beeby pr Mr Parke
Chappell	
Tho ^o Welles	O Bruen
Lewis	Nichols
Bemas	Masters
Mudg	Blatchford

Keny	Hungerford
Parker	Stalton
Wellman	Waller
Brewster	Harwood
Bartlet	Burrows
Morton	Packer
Waterhouse	Doxe
Hempsted	Burden
Fossiker	Marshall
Stanton	

Four names on the list belong to transient or fluctuating residents, viz., Thomas Hanshut, Nathaniel Masters, John Fossiker and John Borden; who, after remaining a year, or two years, and coming and going several times, finally left the plantation.

“ July 30—Richard Hauton a Boston man desires a lot.”

Though here called a Boston man, the name of Richard Haughton is not found on the early records of that place, except in the conveyance of a dwelling-house and garden to Samson Shore, tailor, 27 of 8 mo. 51,¹ which probably was about the period that he removed his family to Pequot. He had married the widow Charlet, of Boston, and the tenement had probably belonged to her. Haughton had a house lot granted on Foxen's Hill.

“ Aug. 15th, 1651.

“ It is agreed that there shall be a common field fenced in; the fence beginning about Greene Harbor, and to run through the woods to Robin Hood's Bay.”

This was for the planting of Indian corn. Robin Hood's Bay is now Jordan Cove. The former appellation was retained but a short time. The name Green Harbor, still in familiar use, came in with the emigrants from Cape Ann, and was probably so called in remembrance of Green Harbor, now Marshfield, where Mr. Blinman and his friends had dwelt before going to Gloucester.

Aug. 29th. The following sketch is supposed from the votes that follow, to show the result of a ballot for deputies to the General Court.

Brewster		7	
Mynor		10	
Parke		2	
Stanton		3	
Bruen		1	
Calkin,		5	

¹ James Savage, Esq., (MS.)

" The Towne have sent to the Court by ther Deputy Hugh Calkin & Thomas Mynor that the Towne's name *may be called London*.

" And to know there enlargement to Pockatuck.

" Also about indians powther."

This second application concerning the name of the town, was no more successful than the former had been. The Court in September, while it confirmed the enlargement of the bounds to Pawkatuck River, called the town by its old name, "*Nameage*."¹

"Memorandums for town meeting, Sept. 20.

" To propound bying of Mr. Parks barne.²

" A rate for Mr. Blynmans half yeer : chuse rater.

" Speak about new drum,

" Chuse one to run the lyne to Pockatuck.

" Read the Towne grant from the Court.

" A training day. A rate for the book of lawes.

" Amos Rieherson is to have a lot."

Richardson was from Boston, and had commercial dealings with the planters. Instead of taking up a new lot, he purchased that of Richard Post, on Post Hill. The conveyance was made to him by Richard Post, *hammersmith*, who henceforth disappears from the roll of inhabitants.

Under this date a minute is made of several rate lists, which are interesting as illustrative of the simplicity of the times. They are the statistics of a fresh-settled, frugal people, with food, raiment and housekeeping of the plainest kind that could be called comfortable, abounding only in land and the hope of future good. After enumerating house and house lot, meadow, marsh and upland, the planter had from two to four cows; half a dozen calves, yearlings and two years old; a litter of swine, and two or three sheep, or perhaps only a share in a stock of two or three sheep. This was all the ratable property of even some of the oldest settlers, as Willey, Waterhouse, and Lewis. Waterhouse had *one ox*, and it is the only one mentioned on five rate lists.

" October.

" John Picket, Mr. Stanton enformed mee, (3 or 4 years agoe) desired a lott—now desires to renew it, and desires a lott by the Dutch Captins, a seaman,—granted.

1 Col. Rec. Conn., vol. 1, p. 224.

2 Mr. Parke's barn was used for the meeting-house, and the call to service was by beat of drum,

"Mrs. Lake requests for upland and meddo to her house lott.

"Cowkeeper expects pay for Cowes he desires to know from us what every one must pay.

"About 6b. to make up the mill dam.

"Another rate for the ministry.

"A rate for the new meeting house."

Other names that make their first appearance during the year 1651, principally as grantees, are :

"Richard Aerie, f. ¹	John Davies,	Edward Messenger,
Goodman Barker, f.	Capt. Denason,	John Pickworth, f.
(of Charlestowne,)	Goodman Garlick, f.	John Read, f.
Lieutenant Bud, f.	John Gesbie, f.	Thomas Roach,
John Coale, f.	John Ingason, f.	William Vincent, f." ²
Edward Codner,		

Very few of these persons became permanent settlers. Most of them, after a short residence and several changes of location, forfeited their grants. It was the rule that lots not built upon or fenced within six months, were forfeited. Grants made in the early part of the year and neglected, were declared *forfeit* at Michaelmas; ² but on application the time was often extended to nine months or a year.

Richard Aery was from Gloucester, and probably a mariner, as he often visited the place in subsequent years.

Lieutenant Budd was from *New Haven colony*. The house lot given him was directly in the center of the town plot, covering what is now called the Parade, leaving only a strip for fort land on the water-side and a highway on the north. The grantee forfeited his lot, and it was given to Amos Richardson in exchange for his Post lot.

John Cole is called "a ploo-right," (plow maker.) Among other grants, "the marsh upon pyne island" was given him. This island, or islet, which lies on the Groton shore, still retains its designation, though long since denuded of the original growth of pines from which it was derived.

Capt. George Denison, from Roxbury, Mass., had a house lot given him on what is now Hempstead Street, opposite the present jail. It has since been known as the old Chapman homestead.

Goodman Garlick was probably the Joseph Garlick afterward of

¹ f., forfeited.

² The 20th of September. Mr. Bruen wrote the word mighelstide.

East Hampton, L. I., who became conspicuous in 1657, on account of the arrest of his wife on suspicion of witchcraft.¹

Thomas Roach is not recorded as a grantee of this year; but in a deposition made by him in 1708, he states that he came to the town "nearly fifty-eight years ago," which would place him in this list.

Nov. 15th, a house lot in the lower part of the town, near Close Cove, was laid out to William Chesebrough; from which it may be inferred that the grantee was purposing to transfer his residence from Pawkatuck, where he had been living a wild and solitary life for upward of two years, to the town plot. There is no evidence that this plan was accomplished, or that he in any way occupied the grant in town. It was afterward given to Mr. Bruen.

Just a month later, Mr. Chesebrough was again before the townsmen, in regard to a private grievance, and obtained an order in his favor.

"Whereas Goodman Chesebrough is as we are informed hindered of John Leighton to fetch home his haie wee the townsmen of Pequot doe order that the said Goodman Chesebrough² shall have liberty to goe any way he shall see most convenient for him to bring it home without any let or hindrance from the said John Leighton. This is determined by us till the Towne shall take further order to dispose both of the way and land."

The town having had their claim to the lands lying east of Mystic River confirmed by the General Court, made their first grant on that side, November 15th, 1651, to Capt. Mason. At the session of the Court in September, a grant had been made to the gallant captain—as a bounty out of the conquered territory—of an island in Mystic Bay (called by the Indians Chippachaug, but since known as Mason's Island) and one hundred acres of land on the adjoining main-land. To this the town added their gratuity, joining another hundred acres to the former grant; and at a subsequent period they extended his boundary still further to the eastward. The main-land portion of this noble farm was washed by the salt water on three sides, forming a neck; and on the north-west was a small brook, called by the Indians *pequot-sepos*, afterward a well known boundary between Mason and Denison land.

¹ Thompson's Hist. Long Island, p. 189. Col. Rec., app., p. 573. Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series, vol. 10, p. 183.

² The older clerks were by no means consistent in their spelling. Mr. Bruen writes Cheesebrooke in one passage and Chesebrough in another. He often made the mistake of writing Blatchfield for Blatchford. John Leighton may have been the same as John Lawton, afterward of Westerly.


Capt. Mason was at that time intent on obtaining the removal of the clan of Indians that had settled under the rule of Cassasinamon on the border of Mystic Bay, opposite his island. At the same date with his first grant from the town, a preamble and resolutions are sketched in the moderator's note-book, with interlineations in Capt. Mason's hand, portending a speedy change of habitation to this forlorn remnant of the Pequot race, who are here called Nemeaks. The townsmen declare that they have special use for the land and the Indians must be removed; "the worshipful Capt. Mason" engages to effect their removal and to place them with Uncas, where they shall have land of their own "as long as Uneas doth hold his interest there and they demean themselves in a quiet and peaceable manner." This proposition, if brought before the town, was not carried: the Indians were not removed from Naiwayonk till sixteen years later. An agreement, however, was made with the Indians, obliging them to keep their planting grounds well fenced, and that they should bear all damages made by cattle of the English on their corn, as well as make good all damage by their cattle on the corn of the English. This was signed by their chief, in behalf of his company, on the moderator's book, Nov. 18th, 1651.

Casesynamon



his mark.

Witnesses.



"Nov. 27, 1651.

"It is ordered that no man shall transport pipe-staves, bolts, clap-boards or shingles from this side of the river without leave of the townsmen upon penalty of 5s. the hundred."

"Feb. 21, 1651-2.

"None shall fell any trees upon the Common within 10 pole of any man's fence, or about the common field fence next unto the Commons."

These regulations display a prudent forethought rather uncommon in the first settlers of a well forested country. The first has a bear-

ing upon the wanton havoc of timber, and the other on the preservation of trees for shade around the borders of the highways and fields. The fathers of the town were solicitous, from the first, to prevent an indiscriminate waste of the wood-lands. Ordinances to preserve the timber upon the commons, and all trees that were desirable to be left for shade in the streets and highways, and also in the broader commons, may be traced downward into the next century. The townsmen were directed to mark all such trees with marking irons with the letter S, and a fine was imposed for cutting them down. In their eagerness to clear the country and open to themselves a broader scope of the sun and stars, they were not unmindful of beauty, propriety and the claims of posterity—arguments which have had less weight with some succeeding generations.

“Dec. 6.

“Mr. Winthrop hath a small island given him: one of the outermost of Mistick’s islands yt lies next his own island, yt upon which he puts his ram goates, now named Ram-Goat island.”¹

Several of the larger farmers, at this period, made an attempt to keep goats. On the east side of the river were several large herds containing from twenty to fifty goats. A by-law was made for their regulation:

“May 28, 1651.

“It is ordered that all dammage done by goates is to be viewed by three indifferent men, and as they shall judge the real dammage, double dammage is to be allowed.”

Mr. Winthrop was probably the only one who persevered in raising goats. At a time when the Narragansett Indians were considered turbulent, (November, 1654), a report was current “that they had killed two hundred of Mr. Winthrop’s goats.”²

The Mystic islands, with the exception of Chippachaug or Mason’s Island, were small and of slight value, and yet were early solicited from the town as grants.

“Dec. 15, 1651.

“Thomas Mynor hath given him at Mistick a small island lying between Chipichuock [Mason’s Island] and the Indians; at the east end of it there is a little upland full of bushes.”

1 Now Bradford’s Island, a favorite summer resort.

2 Mass. Hist. Coll., 8d series, vol. 10, p. 4.

The possession of this island was contested with Mr. Miner, and he surrendered the grant. It is probable that Mr. Blinman had some claim to it, and that it was the island granted to the latter, as follows—

“ Feb. 5, 1653, [‘4.]

“ Mr. Blinman hath given him a small island, a woody island against Capt. Mason’s island at Mistick : called by the Indian name of Ashowugheummocke.”

In May, 1655, “a small woody island near his island at Mistick” was granted to “Major Mason of Seabrook.” This is probably a third grant of the same island. “Sixpenny island at the mouth of Mistick,” was granted to Robert Hempstead and John Stebbins in 1652. Notwithstanding its derisive name it contained near twenty acres of marsh.

During the winter of 1651-2 the common lands upon the Great Neck, consisting of all the *old ground* between the town and Alewife Brook,¹ were laid out and divided by lot. The lots were arranged in tiers upon the river to the brook, and then beyond, by what was called “the blackamore’s river,”² and from thence along the Sound. These were for plowing and mowing lots, and in the rear was laid out a series of woodland lots, double the size of the others and reaching from the ox-pasture near the town to Robin Hood’s Bay. If this were not sufficient, the measurers were to go forward towards the north of Uhuhiock³ River, until all had their lots laid out. These difficult divisions appear to have been managed with skill and fairness. It is interesting to note the care and precision with which the townsmen form the plan and give the directions to the surveyors. The one who had the first lot—that is, the lot nearest home—in the mowing land, was to have the last in the wood-land: and the portions of the common fencing were arranged in the same order. Care was taken that all should have equal portions of old and new ground, and it was a general rule that allowance should be made for defects. All large rocks and swamps unfit for use, were to be left unmeasured and cast into the nearest lots.

The agreements made with the cow-keepers display the same principles of prudential care and equal justice. The cattle were divided

1 This is Lower Alewife Brook, a pleasant little stream on the Great Neck.

2 A brook beyond Alewife, so called at that time on account of some Indian wigwams remaining near it.

3 Or Uhuhiock, the aboriginal name of Jordan Brook.

into two herds, with each a keeper, who began his time at the 19th of April, and received the herd at certain portions of the town, going forth with them at sun half an hour high and bringing them home half an hour before the sun set.

" For the Lords days he is to keep them every 4th Lords day and to give one days notice to him that hath most cattle first to keep them upon the Lords day and so whoever hath one more than an other to warn him before he that hath fewer to keep them a Lord's day and after he that hath but one cow shall keep them his day, then to begin again with him that hath most, twice warning them that have double the cattle that their neighbors have before once warning him that hath but half that his neighbor hath.

" The keeper for his paines is to have 12s. a weeke—for his pay he is to have 1 pound of butter for every cow, and the rest of his pay in wompum or Indiane Corne, at 2s. 6d. p. bushell in the moneth of October."

The waste marsh generally overflowed, was given to a company of undertakers, viz., Mr. Denison, Hugh Caulkins, John Elderkin and Andrew Lester, who undertook to drain it, and were to have all the land " now under water forever." It was added :

" The undertakers have liberty to make a weare. They are to leave it open two nights every week for the coming up of the alewives. The town to have freedom to take what they please at the usual place or to buy them at the weare at 20 alewives for a penny for their eating."

The salt marshes were esteemed as the first class of lands by the planters. Those near the harbor's mouth were known by the Indian name of Quaganapoxet and were mostly granted to the settlers from Gloucester, as a kind of bonus to induce them to remove, and as furnishing a ready-made food for the cattle they brought with them. They are often referred to as " the marshes given to Cape Ann men."

March 17th, 1651-2.

Among the subjects minuted to be brought before the townsmen, is the following :

" Mudge's will :—his house and house lot : Thomas Mynor puts in for a debt of 20sh." [i.e., due to him from estate of Mudge.]

The decease of Jarvis Mudge probably occurred two or three days before this date. It is the first death in the plantation to which any allusion is made on records now extant. Thomas Doxey died about the same time, but whether at home or abroad is not known, as no contemporaneous reference is made to the event. He had a grant of land recorded to him, Dec. 2d, 1651, and his wife is called " widow Kathren Doxey" on the 9th of April, 1652. Jarvis Mudge

was undoubtedly interred in the old burial-ground, as it lay contiguous to his house lot and had not then been inclosed. It is probable that these were the first relics left to molder in that venerable place. The families of these two deceased individuals soon removed to other parts of the country, leaving none of either name in New London. Wills and inventories were at that time engrossed upon the town book, and sent to the Assistants' Court at Hartford for probate; but no papers relative to the estate of either Mudge or Doxey are extant, except the following item.

"June 18, 1653. The Court at Hartford give liberty to the townsmen of Pequot to dispose of the lot of the widow Mudge towards the paying of the debts, and the bettering of the children's portions."¹

The first registered death was that of a child born in the town.

"Ann daughter of Thomas and Grace Minor born 28 April 1649: died 13 August 1652."

A blacksmith is an important personage in a new settlement. Richard Post and others of the first comers were of this profession, but they had left the place, and an invitation was extended to John Prentis, of Roxbury, to become an inhabitant and wield the hammer for the public benefit. The town of Hadley had made a similar proposal to him,² but he came to Pequot on a visit of inquiry, and entered into a contract with Mr. Winthrop and the townsmen, who, being authorized by the town, engaged, if he would remove, to build him a house and shop, pay the expense of his transportation, and provide him with half a ton of iron, also "twenty or thirty pound of steele," to be ready by the middle of May. These articles were signed Feb. 28th, 1651-2, and at the same date he received the usual accommodations of a planter, house lot, upland and meadow. The house lot of two acres was in an eligible and central position, at the corner of the present State and Bank Streets.³

About the same period a house lot near the mill brook was laid out to Lieutenant Samuel Smith, from Wethersfield, a person whose respectable standing as an officer and capacity for business made him a welcome inhabitant. He was subsequently chosen "the towne's leivetenant."

¹ New London Town Book.

² Sylvester Judd, Esq., of Northampton, (MS.)

³ The Prentis lot with two houses upon it, one of them altered from the shop, was purchased in Feb., 1668 by Joshua Raymond. A part of it was owned by the Raymonds for 150 years.

" May 20.

" Water [Walter] Harries of Dorchester desires a house lot beyond the plot of land by John Coites. Granted."

This house lot was at the south end of the town, toward Green Harbor. Additions were subsequently made to it from the ox pasture on the opposite side of the way, and a quantity of "hideous rocks" near by were thrown in unmeasured.

" Aug. 29.

" John Stoder [Stoddard] hath a house lot given him at Foxen's hill,—6 acres, highwaisies to be allowed to common land and to fetch stones."

The transportation of stones alluded to in this grant refers to a ledge of granite on the bank of the river, a mile from town, where stones for building were quarried. "A highway to the Quarry" was reserved in grants near it. Winthrop's house and some others were built of stone, probably from this ledge.¹

Other grantees and new inhabitants of 1652.

Thomas Griffin, afterward of Pawkatuck.

William Rogers, from Boston.

Nehemiah Smith, sometime of New Haven.

Richard Smith, from Martin's Vineyard. He bought the Mudge house lot, but after a few years removed to Wethersfield.

Nathaniel Tappin: grants forfeited.

The charge of the town-clerk for his services during the year 1652, was as follows:

" O. B. for writing and recording for the Towne, orders, agreements, petitions, letters, Court grants, rates, gathering and perfecting rates, writing before, at, and after town meeting, covenants of cow-keeper and smith, £6."

In 1652 a general apprehension existed throughout the country that the Indians were preparing for hostilities. The Narragansetts were especially regarded with suspicion, and preparations were made in the frontier towns to guard against surprise. At Pequot the town orders were peremptory for arming individuals and keeping a vigilant eye upon the natives. Watchmen were kept on the look-out, both night and day. A fresh supply of ammunition was procured and the following directions published :

1 The houses of James Rogers and Edward Stallion, both built before 1660, were of stone. Stallion's was on the Town Street: afterward Edgecombe property.

"July 8, 1652.

"forfeiture of false raising of an alarum 10*l.*

"forfeiture of not coming when an alarum is raised 5*l.*

"forfeiture of not coming to there pticular squadron 5*l.*

"It is agreed y' it shall be a just alarum when 3 gunnes are distinctly shot of, and the drum striking up an alarum.

"If the watchmen here a gunn in the night, they well considering where the gunn was firing if they conceive to be in the Towne may raise an alarum.

"for the seting of a gunn for a wolfe they y' set a gunn for that end shall acquaint the constable where he sets it that he may acquaint the watch."

Three places in the town were fortified, the mill, the meeting-house, and the house of Hugh Caulkins, which stood at the lower end of the town, near the entrance of Cape Ann Lane. The inhabitants were divided into three squadrons, and in case of an alarm Sergeant Miner's squadron was to repair to Hugh Caulkins', Captain Denison's to the meeting-house, and Lieut. Smith's to the mill.

Severe restrictions were laid upon the trade with the Indians in the river, which was to be confined to Brewster's trading-house. No individual could go up the river and buy corn without a special license, which was only to be given in case of great scarcity. Happily no alarm occurred, and all fear of an Indian war soon died away. But Mr. Brewster was allowed for several years to monopolize the Indian trade. This granting of monopolies was perhaps the greatest error committed by the fathers of the town in their legislation.

"April 25, 1653.

"Captain Denison, Goodman Cheesebrooke, Mr. Brewster, and Obadiah Bruen are chosen to make a list of the male persons in town 16 years old and upward, and a true valuation of all real and personal estate of the said persons according to order of the Court. Goodman Cheesebrooke is chosen Commissioner to carry the list to the Court in September next."

This was the first list of the town returned to the General Court, the inhabitants having been heretofore free from the colonial tax. The list amounted to £3,334, which ranked the town sixth in the colony: the five river towns, Hartford, Windsor, Wethersfield, Farmington and Saybrook, took the precedence.

The house lot grants for this year were not numerous. After 1652 there was no general resort of settlers to the plantation. Feb. 20th a house lot on Lower Mamacock, with other accommodations, was pledged to a Mr. Phillips *in case he come.* This was perhaps the same lot that had been given to John Elderkin and surrendered by him. Mr. Phillips never came, and the next December the lot

was given to John Picket and Thomas Hungerford for fire-wood. This is worthy of notice, as showing that the rugged promontory, now almost denuded of trees, smoothed down, and crowned with a noble fortress, could then boast of verdant boughs and forest walks.

August 9th, house lots were granted to "Amos Richardson's brother the millwright"—afterward called his brother-in-law—and to "Nehemiah Smith's brother," without naming them. The former subsequently had a grant of a large farm east of the river under the same vague denomination: he has not been identified. The latter was John Smith, who had been for some time resident in Boston, and came to Pequot with wife and one daughter. At the same time a grant was made to "Goodman White, shoemaker, of Dorchester," of whom there is no subsequent notice. November 20th, grants were made to Edward Culver of a farm at Mystic and a house lot in town.

"Dec. 5. Goodman Harries for his son Gabriell hath given him sixe ackers of upland for an house lot ioyning next to his father's."

This was doubtless a preparatory step to the marriage of Gabriel Harris and Elizabeth Abbot, which took place at Guilford, March 8d, 1653-4. Tradition adds to the simple record of the marriage many romantic incidents. It is said that a vessel with emigrants from England, bound to New Haven, put in to Pequot Harbor for a shelter in foul weather and anchored near the lonely dwelling of the Harris family, which stood upon the river side. Gabriel went off in his fishing boat and invited the emigrants to his father's house. The whole party accordingly landed, and a great part of the night was spent in feasting and hilarity. One of the emigrants was a young female, to whom Gabriel was so assiduous and successful in his attentions, that when the company returned to the vessel they were betrothed lovers. Some, indeed, relate that a clergyman or magistrate was present, and the young couple were actually married that night. But the tradition that harmonizes best with fact is, that the emigrants went on their way, and the young man shortly afterward new painted and rigged his father's pinnace and following the wake of the vessel through the Sound, came back merrily, bringing a bride and her household gear.¹

Bream Cove was at this time a noted landing-place. The decked boats and pinnaces used in that day ran nearly up to the head, and on the west side were several shore rocks, where it was convenient

¹ The record of this marriage was communicated by Ralph D. Smith, Esq., of Guilford. Elizabeth Abbot was probably a daughter of Robert Abbot, of Branford.

to land. The house lots of Robert Hempstead and James Bemas reached to the cove, with the highway (now Coit Street) separating them into two divisions. In December, 1653, the remainder of the land on the east side of the cove, was divided equally between three other B's, Beckwith, Bruen and Blatchford. About the same time, also, Mr. Blinman removed to the lower part of the town and had his house lot on the west side of the same cove, where it is supposed that he dwelt until he left the place.¹ His house stood near where the old bridge crossed the cove.

"Dec. 19. Mrs. Lake hath given her in the woods west from the town at a plaine, by a pond called Plaine lake, 300 acres of upland with the meado by the pond and the pond."

The beautiful sheet of water here called Plain Lake has since been called Lake's Lake, or Lake's Pond, and is now included in Chesterfield society, Montville. The farm laid out to Mrs. Lake, nominally three hundred acres, being measured with the generous amplitude so common in that day, was twice the size of the literal grant. It was of a seven-cornered figure, inclosing the beautiful oval lake. Within the area were hill-sides and glens, wood-lands and swamps almost impenetrable. This estate was bequeathed by Mrs. Lake to the children of her daughter Gallop, by whom it was sold to the Prentis brothers, sons of John Prentis.

The new inhabitants of 1654 were John Lockwood, William Roberts, William Collins, Sergeant Richard Hartley and Peter Bradley. Hartley appears to have come from England with a stock of English goods, which he opened in a shop on Mill Cove. Peter Bradley was a seaman, who married Elizabeth, daughter of Jonathan Brewster, and bought the house lot of John Gallop. John Chynnery, of Watertown,² at the same period bought Capt. Denison's homestead, the latter having previously removed to Mystic.

April 9th. The order was re-enacted, enforcing attendance upon town meeting and a fine of one shilling imposed upon absentees when lawfully warned.

"The aforesaid fyne also they shall pay if they come not within halfe an houre after the beating of the drum and stay the whole day or untill they be dismissed by a publick voate."

¹ This swarm of B's appears to have been unconsciously gathered around the cove. Peter Harris afterward built on the spot occupied by Mr. Blinman.

² Perhaps this was the John Chenary, who was one of sixteen men, slain by the Indians Sept. 4th, 1675, at Squakeag. Coffin's Newbury, p. 389.

The order for a town meeting was given by the townsmen to the constable, who gave notice to the warner and drummer. The warner left a summons at every house: the drum began to beat half an hour before the time for business, and if a constable, two townsmen and fifteen inhabitants appeared, it was a legal meeting.

“ June 2. Goodman Harries is chosen by the Towne ordinary keeper.

“ June 20. Capt. Denison is chosen Commissioner and to him is chosen Mr. Brewster Mr. Stanton and Hugh Calkin to make a list of the state of the towne and the inhabitants and to make the Country rate of Twenty pounds.”

August 28th. The former law granting a tax of sixpence from every family for the killing of a wolf, was repealed, and a bounty of twenty shillings substituted.

“ The Towne having nominated and chosen Goodman Cheesbrooke, Obadiah Bruen and Hugh Calkin whom to present to the Court desire that they may have power together with Mr. Winthrop and Captin Denison or any three of them for the ending of small causes in the town.”

This petition was not granted and the inhabitants were obliged for some time longer to carry their law cases to Hartford for adjudication.

“ Nov. 6.

“ John Elderkin was chosen Ordinary Keeper.

“ An order from the Court forbidding the sale of strong liquors by any but persons licensed by the Court was published.

“ Widdo Harris was granted by voat also to keep an ordinary if she will.”

Walter Harris died the day this vote was taken, and Elderkin was chosen as his successor, who was confirmed in his office and licensed by the General Court. At the northern extremity of the town, on Foxen's Hill, another inn was established about this period, by Humphrey Clay and his wife Katherine. How far it was sanctioned by the town we can not learn, as the note-books of Mr. Bruen from the early part of 1655, to September, 1661, are lost and the regular town book is scanty in its record. The inn of Mr. Clay continued to be a place of notoriety until 1664, when it was broken up and its landlord banished from the place for breaches of law and order.

“ At a General Town meeting Sept. 1, 1656.

“ George Tongue is chosen to keep an ordinary in the town of Pequot for the space of 5 years, who is to allow all inhabitants that live abroad the same privilege that strangers have, and all other inhabitants the like privilege excepting lodging. He is also to keep good order and sufficient accommodation according to Court Order being not to lay it down under 6 months warning, unto which I hereunto set my hand

“ GEORGE TONGUE.”

George Tongue about this period bought the house and lot of Thomas Stanton on the Bank, north-east of the Picket lot; and here he opened the house of entertainment which he kept during his life, and which, being continued by his family, was the most noted inn of the town for sixty years.

The establishment of a regular ferry over the river was an object of prime importance to the inhabitants, all of whom had shares of land in two or three parcels on the east side. The waters at this spot may be technically termed *rugged*. There is no bar, as at Saybrook, to mitigate the vehemence of the swell, and the mouth of the river lying open to the Sound, it sometimes rolls like the sea. The width across in the narrowest part opposite the town, is a little less than half a mile; but it spreads both above and below this point to nearly three-quarters of a mile. November 6th, 1651, articles were drawn to lease the ferry to Edward Messenger for twenty-one years. This arrangement lasted two or three years, and then Messenger gave up his lease and removed to Windsor.

In 1654 the disposal of the ferry was left to Mr. Winthrop and the townsmen, who entered into "articles of agreement" with Cary Latham, granting him a lease and monopoly of

"The ferry over Pequot river, at the town of Pequot, for fifty years—from the twenty-fifth of March,¹ 1655. The said Cary to take 3d. of every passenger for his fare, 6d. for every horse or great beast, and 3d. for a calf or swine:—and to have liberty to keep some provisions and some strong liquors or wine for the refreshment of passengers.—No English or Indian are to pass over any near the ferry place that they take pay for,—if they do the said Cary may require it."

Mr. Latham, on his part, bound himself to attend the service immediately with a good canoe and to provide, within a year's time, a sufficient boat to convey man and beast. He also engaged to build a house on the ferry lot east of the river before the next October, to dwell there and to keep the ferry carefully, or cause it to be so kept, for the whole term of years.

In October, 1654, the first levy of soldiers was made in the plantation. The New England confederacy had decided to raise an army of two hundred and seventy men and send them into the Narragansett country to overawe the Indians. Connecticut was to furnish forty-five men, with the necessary equipments; and of this force the

¹ This was the first day of the civil year.

quota of Pequot was "four men, one drum, and one pair of cullers." The expedition was a fruitless one: the soldiers suffered many hardships, but had little fighting to do.

In May, 1657, Mr. Brewster was made an assistant and Mr. Winthrop chosen governor of the colony. This last act caused the removal from town of its friend and patron. The varied information of Mr. Winthrop; his occasional practice as a physician; his economical science; his readiness to enter into new paths of enterprise; his charity, kindness and affability, made him extremely popular. His residence in the town was a privilege, although public affairs for two or three years, had kept him much of the time away. But it was manifestly inconvenient for the chief magistrate to reside at Pequot, which was then in a corner of the colony, with a wilderness to be traversed in order to reach any other settlement. At the solicitation of the General Court, he removed with his family and goods to Hartford.

" 12 Aug: 1657—This Court orders that Mr. Winthrop, being chosen Governor of this Colony, shall be again desired to come and live in Hartford, with his family, while he governs, they grant him the yearly use or profits of the housing and lands in Hartford belonging to Mr. John Haynes, which shall be yearly discharged out of the public treasury."

" Oct. 1. The Court doth appoint the Treasurer to provide horses and men to send for Mr. Winthrop, in case he is minded to come to dwell with us."¹

Before Mr. Winthrop's removal to Hartford he leased the town mill to James Rogers, a baker from Milford, who had traded much in the place, and in 1657 or 1658 became an inhabitant. As an accommodation to Mr. Rogers in point of residence, he also alienated to him a building spot from the north end of his home-lot, next to the mill; on which Mr. Rogers erected a dwelling-house and bakery, both of stone.

Mr. Winthrop's own homestead, in 1660 or 1661, passed into the occupancy of Edward Palmes, who had married his daughter Lucy. Mr. Palmes was of New Haven, but after his marriage transferred his residence to the Winthrop homestead; which, with the farm at Nahantick, the governor subsequently confirmed to him by will. In that document this estate is thus described:

" The Stone-house, formerly my dwelling house in New London with garden and orchard as formerly conveyed to said Palmes and in his use and possession, with the yard or land lying to the north of the said house to join with

¹ Col. Rec., vol. 1, pp. 801, 806.

James Rogers :—" also a lot of 6 acres lying east of the house bounded north by the oxe-pasture and east by the Great River, and having two great oak trees near the south line."

This stone house, built in 1648, stood near the head of the cove on the east side, between the street (since laid out and appropriately named Winthrop Street) and the water. The *ox pasture* to which the will refers was inclosed the same year. Samuel Beeby, in a deposition of 1708, testified that he and his brother made the fence to it "sixty years since," and that "Mr. Winthrop's goats and cattle were kept therein as well as his oxen." The "old stone house" is mentioned in the will of Major Palmes, in 1712, who bequeathed it to his daughter Lucy, the only child of his first wife; who, having no children, left it to her brothers, Guy and Bryan Palmes. This home-stead is supposed to have been for more than a century the only dwelling on the neck, which was then a rugged point, lying mostly in its natural state and finely shaded with forest trees. It was sold about 1740 to John Plumbe.

The mill, being a monopoly, could not fail to become a source of grievance. One mill was manifestly insufficient for a growing community, and the lessee could not satisfy the inhabitants. Governor Winthrop subsequently had a long suit with Mr. Rogers for breach of contract in regard to the mill, but recovered no damages. The town likewise uttered their complaints to the General Court, that they were not "duely served in the grinding of their corn," and were thereby "much damnified;" upon which the Court ordered, that Mr. Rogers, to prevent "disturbance of the peace," should give "a daily attendance at the mill."

After 1662, the sons of the governor, Fitz John and Wait Still Winthrop, returned to the plantation and became regular inhabitants. Between the latter and Mr. Rogers a long and troublesome litigation was maintained in regard to bounds and trespasses, notices of which are scattered over the records of the County Court for several years. In 1669, Capt. Wait Winthrop set up a bolting mill on land claimed by Mr. Rogers, who, as an offset, immediately began to erect a building, on his own land, but in such a position as wholly to obstruct the only convenient passage to the said bolting mill. This brought matters to a crisis. Richard Lord, of Hartford, and Amos Richardson, of Stonington, were chosen umpires, and the parties interchangeably signed an agreement as a final issue to all disputes, suits at law and controversies, from the beginning of the world to the date thereof.

Winthrop paid for the land on which the mill stood; Rogers took down his building frame, and threw the land into the highway, and all other differences were arranged in the like amicable manner.¹

In March, 1658-9 the General Court appointed John Smith commissioner of the customs at New London. This was the first regular custom-house officer in the town, and probably in the colony.

May, 1660, the General Court granted New London to have an assistant and three commissioners with full power to issue small causes. For the year ensuing Mr. John Tinker was chosen assistant; Mr. Bruen, James Rogers and John Smith, commissioners.

Feb. 25th, 1659-60. At this annual town meeting a paper of instruction and advice was prepared for the use of the townsmen and sanctioned by the public voice, which furnishes a clear summary of the various duties of those unsalaried officers called townsmen or selectmen, so essential in the organization of our New England towns. This document appears to have been drawn up in answer to a previous application of the townsmen, "to know of the town what their duties were." In substance as follows:

1. To keep up the town bounds, and see that the fence-viewers discharge their duty with respect to individual property.
2. To take care that children are educated, servants well ordered and instructed, and no person suffered to live in idleness.
3. That the laws of the jurisdiction be maintained;—no inmates harbored above two or three weeks without consent of the town; and the magazine kept supplied with arms and ammunition.
4. That the streets, lanes, highways and commonways be preserved free from all encroachments and that they appoint some equal way for the clearing of the streets in the town from trees, shrubs, bushes and underwood, and call forth the inhabitants in convenient time and manner for effecting the same.
5. That they take care of the meeting-house and provide glass windows for it, with all convenient speed.
6. "That they consider of some absolute and perfect way and course to be taken for a perfect platforme of settling and maintaining of the recordes respecting the towne, that they be fully clearly and fairly kept, for the use, benefit and peaceful state of the town, and after posterity."
7. That they consult together and with the moderator, of all matters to be propounded at town meetings, so as better to effect needful things and prevent needless questions and cogitations.
8. That they determine all matters concerning the Indians that inhabit amongst us.

1 The Rogers homestead was purchased by Madam Winthrop in 1718, and reunited to the original estate. John Winthrop, Esq., the son of Wait Winthrop, about that period removed to New London, and fixed his residence on this spot.

9. That they regulate the felling, sawing and transporting of timber; masts, boards, planks, pipe-staves, &c.
10. That they see the ferries well kept.
11. That they determine all complaints respecting land grants; except the difficult and doubtful cases, which must be referred to the town.
12. That they have regular meetings for business and give notice of the time and place thereof, by a paper upon the meeting-house.

Signed by JOHN TINKER, Moderator.

Before quitting this period it will be proper to gather up the names (not yet mentioned) of residents that came in during the interval for which Mr. Bruen's minutes are lost.

Addis, William: came from Boston 1659 or 59.

Bartlet, Robert: brother of William, first mentioned 1657.

Bloomfield, William, from Hartford, 1659: removed in 1663 to Newtown,
L. I.

Bowen, Thomas, 1657: removed to Rehoboth, and there died in 1663.

Brooks, Thomas, 1659 and '60: afterwards removed.

Chapman William, 1657: bought the house and lot that had been Capt. Denison's of Mr. Blinman, agent of John Chynnery.

Cowdall, John, a trader who became bankrupt in 1659, and left the place.

Crocker, Thomas: bought house in New Street, 1660.

Douglas, William: from Boston, 1659.

Lenard, Thomas, 1657: house lot at Foxen's—removed in 1663.

Loveland, Robert: mariner and trader from Boston, 1659.

Moose, Miles: from Milford, 1657: purchased the homestead and other allotments of John Gager.

Raymond, Joshua, 1659.

Richards, John. The first notice of him is in 1660, but he may have been in the plantation two or three years. He purchased, on what is now State Street—the south side—two houselots originally given to Waterhouse and Bruen. He built his house at the corner of the present Huntington Street, and this remained for more than a century the homestead of the family.

Royce, Robert, 1657.

Shaw, Thomas, 1656: was afterward of Pawcatuck.

Smith, Edward, 1660: nephew of Nehemiah and John Smith.

Tinker, John: a grave and able man, from the Massachusetts colony.

Wetherell, Daniel: from Scituate, 1659.

Wood, John, 1660.

CHAPTER VI.

General sketch of grants,—west and east of the river,—at Mystic and Pawktuck.—Early grantees east of the Mystic.—Contention for the jurisdiction.—The plantation named Stonington.

THE first grants had been made on a limited scale, and with reference to immediate occupation and improvement. But after 1651, the ideas of the planters expanded ; there was an eagerness for the spoils, a thirsting after large domains, and a lavish division of farms both east and west of the river—at Nahantick—up the river toward Mohegan—three miles out of town, *if it be there*—four or five miles, *if he can find it*—at Mystic—at Pawktuck :—a little meadow here, a little marsh there,—the islands, the swamps, and the ledges,—till we might fancy the town was playing at that ancient game called *Give away*. Divisions to old settlers and grants to new ones, follow in rapid succession, and the clerk and moderator record little else. A brief survey of the most prominent grants, is all that will be here attempted.

The first farm taken up at Nahantick was by Mr. Winthrop. It is not found recorded, but is mentioned as the farm which Mr. Winthrop chose. It consisted of 6 or 700 acres, east of the bar and Gut of Nahantick, including what is now Millstone Point, and extending north to the country road. In October, 1660, the General Court added to this farm the privilege of keeping the ferry near it, which caused it to be known as the Ferry farm. It was a part of the portion bestowed by Mr. Winthrop on his daughter Lucy, the wife of Edward Palms.

Adjoining the Ferry farm was that of John Prentis, and north of these, on the bay, Hugh Caulkins and William Keeny ; at Pine Neck, Mr. Blinman ; “rounding the head of the river,” Isaac Willey ; and yet farther west, Matthew Beckwith ; whose land, on the adjustment of the boundary with Lyme, was found to lie mostly within the

bounds of that town, though his house was on the portion belonging to New London.

Mr. Bruen had an early grant on the west side of Jordan Cove, which is still known as Bruen's Neck: George Harwood's land joined Bruen's. This locality was designated as "old ground that had been planted by Indians." Robert Parke had a valuable grant at Poquiogh—the Indian name of the tract east of the cove—and next to him, smaller portions were laid out to the Beeby brothers. "The three Beebys" had also divisions at Fog Plain, a name which is still in familiar use. Many of the small grants on this plain were bought up by William Hough.

In the course of a few years, James Rogers, by purchasing the divisions of Robert Hempstead and Robert Parke, called Goshen, and various smaller shares of proprietors, became the largest land-holder on the neck. Himself, three sons, and son-in-law, Samuel Beeby, all had farms in this quarter. The Harbor's Mouth farm, was an original grant to Mr. Blinman, but was afterward the property of John Tinker. Andrew Lester was another early resident upon the neck.

In the district now called Cohanzie, north-west of the town plot, was Mr. Winthrop's Mill-pond farm, which was probably a grant attached to his privilege of the mill-stream. His right to a portion of it, being afterward contested, the witnesses produced in court testified that Mr. Winthrop occupied this farm "before Cape Ann men came to the town."

Not far from the town plot, on the north side of the mill brook, was a swampy meadow called Little Owl Meadow: this was given to James Avery. Advancing still to the northward we meet with a tract of high ridgy land, often called *the Mountain*. Here Edward Palms, and Samuel and Nathaniel Royce had grants, which were called Mountain farms.¹ This was a rough and barren region.

North of the town on the west bank of the river, was a long array of grants: the most extensive were those of Winthrop, Stebbins, Blinman, Lothrop, Bartlet and Waterhouse. Mr. Blinman's farm included "Upper Mamoquack Neck." The grant of Waterhouse covered "the Neck at the Straits' Mouth."

Winthrop had other important grants in this quarter. April 14th,

¹ An English emigrant at a later day settled on one of these farms; and the witticism was current that he selected the spot on the supposition that *from the top of the rocks he could see England*.

1653, the whole water-course of Alewife Brook was granted him, with ample privileges of erecting mills, making dams and ponds, cutting down timber, and taking up land on its banks. He erected a house near the saw-mill in 1658, probably the first on the west side of the river, so far north as this. This was followed a few months later by a grant of land, and saw-mill privileges still farther north, on the Saw-mill Brook, near the present Uncasville factory. On the same Saw-mill Brook, John Elderkin, in the course of a few years, accumulated 770 acres, which he sold April 22d, 1662, to Mr. Antipes Newman, of Wenham, son-in-law to Mr. Winthrop.¹

Daniel Comstock, who was the son-in-law of Elderkin, was an early resident in this vicinity. A farm on Saw-mill Brook, originally given to Lieut. Samuel Smith, was purchased by Comstock, in 1664, and has remained ever since in the occupation of his descendants.

The earliest grants in the southern part of Groton or Poquonock, have been already mentioned. They were highly valued, as the soil could be brought into immediate use. Some of it was meadow and marsh, and a considerable portion of the upland had been formerly cultivated by the Indians. Allusions in the boundaries of grants, are made to the Indian paths and the Indian fort. Many of the original small grants were afterward bought up by merchants for speculation. Major Pyncheon, of Springfield, and his partner James Rogers, engrossed more than 2,000 acres. In December, 1652, a highway was laid out running directly through the narrow lots, above the head of Poquonock Cove to Mystic River. This answers to the present main road to Mystic Bridge. The earliest settlers on the west side of the Mystic, were Robert Burrows, John Packer, and Robert Parke. Burrows had a grant of "a parcel of land between the west side of the river and a high mountain of rocks," dated April 3d, 1651. It is not probable that houses were built and actual settlements effected before 1653. Aaron Starke and John Fish were said to be of *Mystic*, in 1655; John Bennet, in 1660; Edmund Fanning, in 1662, and Edward Culver, in 1664. Edward Culver's farm was called by the Indians Chepadaso.

William Meades, James Morgan, James Avery, Nehemiah and John Smith, were early resident farmers in South Groton. They

1 A tripartite division of this land was made in 1703, among Mr. Newman's heirs, viz., John Newman, physician of Gloucester, Elizabeth Newman, spinster, and Sybil, wife of John Edwards, of Boston.

received their grants in 1652 and '53, but continued to reside in the town plot with their families till about 1655. Between this and 1660, they transferred their residence to the other side of the river. Cary Latham, as lessee of the ferry, was the first to be domiciliated upon Groton Bank. Thomas Bayley settled north of Winthrop's land on the river. The Chesters, Lesters, Starrs, were somewhat later upon the ground—not settlers till after 1660. Andrew Lester, Jun., settled upon land given to his father.

Proceeding up the river to that division of the township which is now Ledyard, we find a series of farms laid out on the northern boundary, adjoining Brewster's land, early in 1653, to Allyn, Avery, Coite, Isbell,¹ Picket, and others, which were called the Pockatannock grants. Some of these were found to be beyond the town bounds.

Robert Allyn and John Gager removed to this quarter about 1656. The country in the rear of these hardy pioneers was desolate and wild in the extreme. It was here that the Indian reservation Mashantucket was laid out, and the remnant of the Pequots settled in 1667. Allyn and Gager were so far removed from the town plot as to be scarcely able to take part in its concerns, or share in its privileges. The General Court at their May session in 1658, considerably released them from their fines for not attending the town training.² They appear, however, still to have attended the Sabbath meeting, probably coming down the river in canoes. George Geer married a daughter of Robert Allyn, in 1659, and settled in the neighborhood. A grant to Mr. Winthrop, May 6th, 1656, would probably fall within the present bounds of Ledyard.

"Mr. Winthrop hath given him the stone quarry, south-east of Pockatannock River, near the footpath from Mohegan to Mistick."

Near the eastern boundary of the township, toward the present town of North Stonington, is an elevation that from the earliest settlement has been called Lantern Hill. The name is said to be derived from a large naked rock not far from the summit, which, seen from a distance, in a certain position, or at a certain hour of the day, shines like a light. The Indians had probably named it from this peculiarity, and the English adopted the idea. East of this hill is a great pond, and a chain of ponds,—sources of the Mystic—which

¹ Isbell's farm was bought, 1665, by George Geer.

² Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 317.

at first was regarded as "our outmost bounds" in that direction. In 1652 and 1653, Mr. Winthrop obtained grants of "Lanthorne Hill," the swamps and meadows between the hill and the great pond, with water and timber privileges at his pleasure, and also a strip of land twenty poles wide on each side of the Mystic, "from the place where the tide flows to the end of our bounds up the river."

Capt. Mason's grant east of the Mystic has been noticed. A series of other grants on that side commenced Dec. 30th, 1652, with 200 acres to Capt. Denison, whose eastern boundary was the Pequot-sep̄os, mentioned in Mason's grant; and 260 to Mr. Blinman, to be laid out in the same form as Denison's, viz., 100 poles in breadth upon the river. Other grantees of nearly the same date were James Morgan, Mr. Winthrop, John Gallop, Mrs. Lake,¹ Mr. Parke and the Beeby brothers, (now increased to *four*.) Mr. Blinman after a year or two relinquished his Mystic farm to Thomas Parke, in exchange for the accommodations of the latter in the town plot. Denison, Gallop, Robert and Thomas Parke, and Nathaniel Beeby, probably removed to their farms in 1654. Denison sold what he styles "my new dwelling-house," in the town plot, to John Chynnery, of Watertown, early in that year.

The grants to John Gallop are recorded as follows:

" Feb. 9, 1652-3.

" John Gallop in consideration and with respect unto the services his father hath done for the country, hath given him up the river of Mistick, which side he will, 300 acres of upland."

" Feb. 6, 1653-4.

" John Gallop hath given him a further addition to his land at Mistick, 150 acres; which he accepts of and acknowledgeth himselfe satysfye for what land he formerly laide claime unto upon the General Neck, as a gift of his father's, which as he saith, was given to his father by General Stoughton, after the Pequot warr."²

Between Capt. Mason's farm and Chesebrough's, were several necks of land, extending into the Sound and separated by creeks. The neck east of Mason was allotted to Cary Latham, who in a short time sold it to Thomas Minor. Beyond this were two points or

¹ The wife of John Gallop inherited the land given to her mother, Mrs. Lake.

² This second John Gallop, as well as his father, had performed service against the Pequots. In 1671, the General Court gave bounties of land to various persons who had been engaged in the Pequot War:—among them were three names belonging to New London,—John Gallop, granted 100 acres,—James Rogers, 50,—Peter Blatchford's heirs, 50.

necks, one of them called "a pyne neck," with a broad cove between them : these were granted to Isaac Willey, and sold by him to Amos Richardson. Another still larger neck, called Wampassock, and containing 550 acres of upland, with a smaller neck adjoining, was given to Hugh Caulkins. This was subsequently sold to Winthrop.

Next beyond Caulkins, and separated from him by a brook called Mistuxet, was a tract of several hundred acres allotted to Amos Richardson and his brother. A part of this division was known by the Indian name of Quonaduck.

The number and value of the grants made at various times to Mr. Winthrop, afford conclusive proof that the town was not ungrateful to its founder. It has been seen that at Fisher's Island, at Pequot Harbor, at Alewife Cove and Saw-mill Brook, (north of the Harbor,) at Nahantick, at Groton and at Mystic, he was not only the first and largest proprietor, but apparently the first operator and occupant. It was probably the same on the Pawcatuck River. Roger Williams writing to him in March, 1649, says :

"I am exceedingly glad of your beginnings at Pwokatock."

It was about this time that Winthrop, assisted by Thomas Stanton, held a conference with Ninigret, the Narragansett sachem at Wequacucket, with a view to conciliate his Indian neighbors, and have a fair understanding in regard to bounds. Probably at the same period, or very soon afterward, William Chesebrough, encouraged by Winthrop, and under a pledge from him of assistance and accommodation, erected his first lodge in the wilderness, on the borders of the Wickutequock¹ Creek. Winthrop was then acting under a commission from Massachusetts, and Chesebrough regarded himself as under the jurisdiction of that colony. But in November, 1649, the magistrates of Connecticut took cognizance of the proceedings of Chesebrough, who had engaged in trade with the Indians of Long Island, and sent a warrant to the constable of Pequot, ordering him to desist. This order was disregarded, on the plea that he belonged to another jurisdiction. Subsequently a greater degree of severity was manifested toward him, and he was commanded to leave the territory, or appear before the court and make good his defense.

Mr. Chesebrough was by trade a smith, and the magistrates were apprehensive that he might aid the Indians in obtaining those tools

¹ A cove and creek, east of Stonington Point; perhaps the same as Wequacucket, before mentioned.

and fire-arms which would render them more dangerous as enemies. He appeared at Hartford in March, 1650-51, and made a statement of the facts in his case. He had sold, he said, house and lands at Rehoboth, and all the appurtenances of his trade, not reserving tools even to repair a gun-lock or make a screw pin, and had come with his farming stock to Pequot, with the expectation of settling among the planters there; but not finding accommodations that suited him, he had established himself upon the salt marsh at Pawkatuck, which could be mowed immediately, and would furnish provision for his cattle. In so doing he had been encouraged by Mr. Winthrop, whose commission from Massachusetts was supposed to extend over Pawkatuck. He had not wandered, he said, into the wilderness to enjoy in savage solitude any strange heretical opinions, for his religious belief was in entire harmony with the churches of Christ established in the colonies: moreover, he did not expect to remain long alone, as he had grounds to hope that others would settle around him, if permission from the court might be obtained.¹

The court were undoubtedly right in disapproving of the lonely life he led at Wickutequock. The tendency of man among savages, without the watch of his equals and the check of society, is to degenerate; to decline from the standard of morals, and gradually to relinquish all Christian observances. Yet under the circumstances of the case, they were certainly rigorous in their censure of Chesebrough. The record says, "they expressed themselves altogether unsatisfied." They were no further conciliated than to decree that if he would enter into a bond of £100 not to prosecute any unlawful trade with the Indians, and before the next court would give in the names of "a considerable company" of acceptable persons, who would engage to settle at Pawkatuck before the next winter, "they would not compel him to remove."

In September, 1651, Mr. Chesebrough was again at Hartford, endeavoring to obtain a legal title to the land he occupied. Mr. Winthrop and the deputies from Pequot engaged that if he would place himself on the footing of an inhabitant of Pequot, he should have his land confirmed to him by grant of the town. To this he acceded. In November, a house-lot was given him, which, however, he never occupied. His other lands were confirmed to him by the town, January 8th, 1651-2. The grant is recorded with the following preamble:

¹ Col. Rec., vol. 1, pp. 200, 216.

"Whereas Hugh Calkin and Thomas Minor were appointed by the townsmen of Pequot to view and agree with, and bound out unto William Chesebrough and his two sons, Samuel and Nathaniel, according to a covenant formerly made by Mr. Winthrop, Hugh Calkin and Thomas Minor, with William Chesebrough, at Hartford, to allow them a comfortable, convenient subsistence of land, we do all agree as followeth:—We Hugh Calkin and Thomas Minor have bounded out 300 acres more or less," &c.

After describing the bounds of the tract, which lay on the salt water, covering what is now Stonington Borough, it is added, "the said land doth fully satisfy William Chesebrough and his sons." This grant was, nevertheless, liberally enlarged afterward. In the town book is a memorandum of the full amount given him before the separation of the towns—"uplands, 2,299 acres;—meadows, 63 $\frac{1}{4}$."

On the Pawkatuck River the first white inhabitant was Thomas Stanton. His trading establishment was probably coeval with the farming operations of Chesebrough, but as a fixed resident, with a fireside and a family, he was later upon the ground. He himself appears to have been always upon the wing, yet always within call. As interpreter to the colony, wherever a court, a conference or a treaty was to be held, or a sale made, in which the Indians were a party, he was required to be present. Never, perhaps, did the acquisition of a barbarous language give to a man such immediate, wide-spread and lasting importance. From the year 1636, when he was Winthrop's interpreter with the Nahantick sachem, to 1670, when Uncas visited him with a train of warriors and captains to get him to write his will, his name is connected with almost every Indian transaction on record.

In February, 1649–50, the General Court gave permission to Stanton to erect a trading-house at Pawkatuck and to have "six acres of planting ground and liberty of feed and mowing according to his present occasions;" adding to these grants a monopoly of the Indian trade of the river for three years. These privileges probably induced him to bring his family to Pequot, where he established himself in 1651 and continued to reside, taking part in the various business of the town, until he sold out to George Tongue in 1656. His first town grant at Pawkatuck was in March, 1652—three hundred acres in quantity, laid out in a square upon the river, next to his grant from the Court. The whole of Pawkatuck Neck and the Hommocks (*i. e.*, small islands) that lay near to it were subsequently given him. Other farms were also granted on the Pawkatuck, in the neighborhood of Stanton; and April 4th, 1653, a liberal

grant was made to Mr. Winthrop of the water-course of the river, with liberty to erect dams and mills on any part of it or on any of its branches, and to cut timber on any common land near it, together with a landing-place, and a clause of general privilege annexed, viz.

“Liberty to dig up and make use of any Iron-stone or other stone or earth in any place within the land of this town.”

Thomas Minor, one of the first settlers of Pequot, was one of the first to remove to that part of the plantation called Pawkatuck. His homestead, at the head of Close Cove, was one of the best tenements in the place. The bill of sale mentions house, barn, fences, orchard, garden, yards, apple and pear-trees, and *gooseberry-trees*. Minor reserved the privilege of removing a part of the fruit-trees. Price £50 and possession given the 15th of October, 1652.¹

The next year we find Thomas Minor east of the Mystic, where he bought Latham's Neck, and in December had a town grant,

“Joining his father's land [father-in law, Walter Palmer] at Pockatuck upon the norward side of the path that goes to Mr. Stanton's.”²

Of his subsequent grants, the following are the most considerable.

“June 19, 1655. Thomas Mynor hath given him by consent of the Court held at Pequot and by the townsmen of Pequot 200 acres in a place called Tagwourcke bounded on the south with the foot-path that runs from the head of Mistick river to Pockatuck wading place, and by Chesebrough's land.”

“1657—Granted to Thomas Miner, and his son Clement—from Stony brook easterly, 108 pole joining his former grant,—thence north one mile and 60 pole, thence east 108 pole to his son Clement's grant,—Clement's land to run on an easterly line from this to Walter Palmer's land, whose land bounds it south,” &c.

April 5th, 1652, the townsmen made a grant of three hundred acres at Pawkatuck, lying east and south-east of Chesebrough's land, to Hon. John Haynes, then governor of the colony. The grantee sold it to Walter Palmer, of Rehoboth. The contract was witnessed by Thomas Minor and his son John: possession given July 15th, 1658. The price, one hundred pounds “in such cattle, mares, oxen, and cowes,” as Mr. Haynes should select out of Palmer's stock, and ten pounds to be paid the next year.

This transaction indicates with sufficient accuracy the period of Palmer's settlement on the Sound. His first grant from the town

1 It went into the occupation first of Thomas Parke and next of Richard Haughton.

2 The latter bought it in November, 1655.

2 Referring, probably, to Stanton's trading-house.

was in February, 1653-4—one hundred acres “near to the land he bought of Mr. Haines.” The next year he had five hundred acres, and so on to May, 1655, when a note is made—

“ All his land bought and given, 1190 acres : 56 meadow.”

These were the first and most considerable planters at Pawcatuck, but numerous other grants were made coincident with these. The farms laid out by the townsmen of Pequot were not, indeed, numerous, but the marsh or meadow was allotted in small parcels to some twenty-five or thirty individuals, to supply deficiencies in earlier grants nearer home.

The whole territory, from Nahantick east to Nahantick west, continued to be regarded as one township, acting together in town meetings, in the choice of deputies and in voting for magistrates of the colony. They formed also but one ecclesiastical society, Mr. Blinman's rates being levied over the whole tract until 1657.¹

The early planters at Mystic continued to attend the Sabbath service at Pequot, and were as often consulted about the meeting-house and house for the minister, and other parish business, as before their removal. Occasionally, they were accommodated with lectures in their own neighborhood. After 1657, when Mr. William Thompson was appointed missionary to the Pequots, it is probable that many of the farmers attended the Indian meeting, and that the Minors and Stantons, who were noted proficients in the Indian language, acted as the preacher's interpreters with the Indians.

At a town meeting, August 28th, 1654, an interesting movement was made in regard to Pawcatuck.

“ It was voted and agreed that three or four men should be chosen unto three of Pockatucke and Misticke to debate, reason and conclude whether Misticke and Pockatucke shall be a town and upon what termes; and to determine the case in no other way, but in a way of love and reason, and not by voate: To which end these Seaven, Mr. Winthrop, Goodman Calkin, Cary Latham, Goodman Elderkin, Mr. Robert Parke, Goodman Cheesebrooke and Captain George Denison were chosen by the major part of the towne and soe to act.”

No separation of these sister settlements from Pequot was at this time effected; but their struggles to break loose and form an independent township were henceforth unremitting. Many of the inhab-

¹ “ This Court doth order that the inhabitants of Mistick and Paucatuck shall pay to Mr. Blinman that which was due to him for the last yeare, scil: to March last.” Order of General Court, May, 1657.

itants west of the river likewise regarded a separation as desirable.¹ It might tend to heal the distractions then existing among the settlers at Pawkatuck, who were experiencing the usual calamities of a border land and disputed title. Disunion and misrule were prevalent: neighbor was at variance with neighbor, not only in regard to town rights, but with respect to colonial jurisdiction, the removal of the Indians and the territorial claims of Rhode Island.

In 1657 the call for a separation became too strong to be neglected. The General Court appointed Messrs. Winthrop, Mason, Talcott and Allyn, (the secretary,) to meet at Pequot and compose the differences between that plantation and the inhabitants of Mystic and Pawkatuck; or if not able to effect this, to make a return of the situation of affairs to the next Court.

The contention between Massachusetts and Connecticut for the jurisdiction of Pawkatuck was adverse to her municipal interests. Massachusetts, notwithstanding her distance and the inconsiderable advantage that could accrue to her from the connection, was reluctant to yield her claim to a portion of the Pequot territory, and in September, 1658, the court of commissioners decided that the whole territory should be separated into two plantations; all east of the Mystic to be under the direction of Massachusetts and all west of it to belong to Connecticut:

“Finding that the Pequot country, which extended from Naihantick to a place called Wetapauge about ten miles eastward from Mistick river, may conveniently accommodate two plantations or townships, wee therefore (respecting things as they now stand) doe conclude that Mistick river be the bounds betweene them as to propriety and jurisdiction,” &c.

Pawkatuck by this decision being adjudged to Massachusetts, that colony without delay extended her sway over it and in October conferred upon the inhabitants the privileges of a town, with the name of Southerton. It was annexed to Suffolk county. Walter Palmer was appointed constable; Capt. Denison was to solemnize marriages, and the prudential affairs until a choice of townsmen should be made, were confided to Capt. Denison, Robert Parke, William Chesebrough and Thomas Minor.²

1 Mr. Blinman appears at this time to have supported the separation party, though he afterward gave his influence to the other side of the question. This accounts for an unguarded remark of Capt. Denison, “that Mr. Blinman did preach for Pawcatuck and Mystic being a town before he sold his land at Mystic;” for which he afterward apologized before the General Court. Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 299.

2 In R. I. Hist. Coll., pp. 58, 269, *John* Minor is substituted for Thomas Minor. This is an error.

At the next session of the Court, Major Mason as the advocate of Connecticut, called for a review of the decision. He claimed the territory in question, in behalf of the colony, first, as comprehended within the patent of the lord-proprietors of Saybrook fort, who had expended at least £6,000, not for that small tract alone, but expecting therewith the country round about, as other colonies had done. Second, from possession before the Pequot war—as by holding Saybrook fort, none protesting against it, a right to the country was implied and understood. He also claimed that the tacit allowance of the commissioners for some ten years past confirmed the claim; and finally he asserted that Connecticut had a full and indisputable right by conquest; the overthrow of the Pequots having been achieved by her people, “God succeeding the undertaking,” without any charge, assistance or advice from Massachusetts.

The agents of Massachusetts were as positive and explicit. They claimed at least an equal right by conquest, as having had their forces two or three months in the field, at an expense treble that of Connecticut: they were partners and confederates, and ought to share as such. In point of possession they claimed as having first occupied the country, by building houses in Mr. Stoughton’s time, and then by Mr. Winthrop’s settling on the west side of the river, with a commission from their Court, “himself being most desirous to continue under that government.”

Major Mason rejoined: “you mention a possession house; which house was not in the Pequot country, being on the west side of the river and again deserted and most of it carried away by yourselves before any English again possessed it.”

In the warmth of his argument he here denies that the Pequots had any right to the territory west of the river. As the guardian and advocate of the Mohegans, he probably challenged it all for them.

The claim of Massachusetts from partnership in the Pequot war, he disposes of in the following manner:

“If the English should have beaten the Flemings out of Flanders and they fly into another domain:—if the French should there meet the English and join with them to pursue the Flemings, would that give the French a right to Flanders?”

There is fallacy in this comparison. There can be no doubt but that the two colonies were joint conquerors and as far as conquest gives right, joint proprietors of the Pequot territory. The argument from possession also was nearly equal. Connecticut had in a man-

ner possessed the country by publicly challenging it, by ordering a commission to survey it, and granting lands there to Mason and his soldiers soon after the war. On the other side, Mr. Stoughton, by order of the magistrates of Boston, had selected the place for a plantation, and Mr. Winthrop had commenced his operations under a commission from that colony. One side of the river was as truly conquered country as the other; for the Nameaugs, if not Pequots proper, were virtual members of the confederacy.

The commissioners refused to vary the decision they had made in 1658, and the new township was regarded as an appendage of the Bay colony some four or five years longer. The charter of Connecticut, obtained in 1662, extended the jurisdiction of the colony to the Pawkatuck River. Measures were then taken by the General Court to establish its authority over the premises. The title of Connecticut could not now be fairly disputed, but it was not recognized by all parties and quiet and harmony established, until about 1665.

In October, 1664, the General Court passed an act of oblivion for all past offenses implying a contempt of their authority, to all inhabitants of Mystic and Pawkatuck, "Capt. Denison only except." His offense was more aggravated than that of others, for he had continued to exercise his office as a magistrate commissioned by Massachusetts, after the charter was in operation and he had been warned by the authorities to desist.

The records of the town are extant from 1664. John Stanton was the first recorder; Mr. James Noyes the first minister. A country rate was first collected in 1666. All grants made by the town of Pequot before the separation, were received as legitimate and confirmed by the new authorities.

Orders of the General Court.

"October, 1665.

"Southerton is by this Court named Mistick in memory of that victory God was pleased to give this people of Connecticut over the Pequot Indians."

"May, 1666.

"The town of Mistick is by this Court named Stonington. The court doth grant to the plantation to extend the bounds thereof ten miles from the sea up into the country northward: and eastwards to the river called Pawkatuck.

"This Court doth pass an act of indemnity to Capt. George Denison upon the same grounds as was formerly granted to other inhabitants of Stonington."

Notwithstanding this act of grace Capt. Denison and the authorities at Hartford were not on terms of mutual good-will until the

path of reconciliation was made smooth by the gallant conduct of Denison in the Indian war of 1676.

Another serious cause of disturbance in this young town arose from the unsettled state of the eastern boundary. The plantation had been designed to extend as far east as Wekapaug, the limit of the Pequot country; and this included Sqummacutt, or Westerly, now in Rhode Island. Charles' charter extended the colony to "*Narragansett River*." No such river being known, Connecticut claimed that Narragansett Bay and the river flowing into it from the north-west were the boundary assigned. Rhode Island, on the other hand, asserted that Westerly had belonged to the Nahanticks, not to the Pequots, and that Pawkatuck River was the true Narragansett of the Connecticut charter. Moreover, the country between Narragansett Bay and the Pawkatuck had been included in both her charters, that obtained by Roger Williams in 1644 and that granted by Charles II. in 1663. Mr. Williams observes:

"From Pawkatuck river hitherward being but a patch of ground, full of troublesome inhabitants, I did, as I judge inoffensively, draw our poor and inconsiderable line."

Both colonies extended their jurisdiction over this disputed tract and made grants of the land: the inhabitants consequently adhered some to one side and some to the other. The contest was long and arduous, and had all the incidents usually attendant upon border hostilities, such as overlapping deeds, disputed claims, suits at law, arrests, distraints, imprisonments, scuffles and violent ejectments. The warfare was bloodless, but well seasoned with blows, bruises and abusive language. It was natural that New London should take a lively interest in these struggles. United in their origin; not rivals, but members of the same family; the two plantations, though separated in municipal government, remained bound in fraternal amity. Most of the original inhabitants of Stonington had first been inhabitants of New London, and their names are as familiar to the records of the one place as of the other.

In June, 1670, commissioners appointed by the two colonies to adjust the difficulties between them, met in New London, at the inn of George Tongue; but no compromise could be effected. Capt. Fitz John Winthrop was a member of this committee, and also of another court of commissioners appointed on the same business in 1672.

CHAPTER VII.

The Barn Meeting-house.—First regular Meeting-house.—The Sabbath drum. Burial-place.—Some account of Mr. Blinman and his removals.—The Welsh party.—Mr. Blinman's return to England.

THE first house of worship in the plantation was a large barn, which stood in a noble and conspicuous situation, on what was then called Meeting-house Hill. On all sides the planters with their families *ascended* to the Sabbath service; and the armed watchmen that guarded their worship, might be so placed as to overlook all their habitations. The rude simplicity of these accommodations gives a peculiar interest to the sublimity of the scene. The barn was on the house-lot of Robert Parke, (Hempstead Street, south corner of Granite Street.¹) The watch was probably stationed a little north, on the still higher ground, above the burial-place.²

“ August 29, 1651.

“ For Mr. Parke's barn eth the towne doe agree for the use of it until midsummer next, to give him a day's work a peece for a meeting-house,—to be redy by the Saboth come a moneth.

“ Mem. Mr. Parke is willing to accept of 3l.”

“ [Same date.] Goodman Elderkin doth undertake to build a meeting-house about the same demention of Mr. Parke's his barne, and clapboard it for the sum of eight pounds, provided the towne cary the tymber to the place and find nales. And for his pay he requires a cow and 50s. in peage.”

In 1652, Mr. Parke sold his house-lot to William Rogers, from Boston. The barn had been fitted up for comfortable worship, and is spoken of as *the meeting-house* in the following item.

1 On or near the spot where is now the house of Mr. William Albertson. After the decay of these first old tenements built by Mr. Parke, no dwelling-house was erected on this lot till Mr. Albertson built in 1845.

2 Where is now the house of Capt. John Rice, which stands at the south-east corner of the Blinman lot, and on higher ground than any other habitation in the compact part of New London.

" 30 June, '52. Wee the townsmen of Pequot have agreed with Goodman Rogers for the meeting-house for two years from the date hereof, for the summe of 32. per annum. If we build a leantoo he is to allow for it in the rent, and if it come to more he is to allow it, and for flooring and what charges the town is at, he is willing to allow when the time is expired."

In the meantime a rate of £14 was levied to build a new meeting-house, and the site fixed by a town vote, December 16th, 1652, which Mr. Bruen thus records :

" The place for the new meeting-house was concluded on by the meeting to be in the highwaie, taking a corner of my lot to supply the highwaie."

The highway here referred to, with the north part of Mr. Bruen's lot relinquished for the purpose, formed the area now known as the Town Square, and this first meeting-house is supposed to have stood precisely upon the site of the present alms-house.¹ It was undoubtedly a building of the simplest and plainest style of construction, yet full three years were consumed in its erection. Capt. Denison and Lieutenant Smith were the building committee, and collected the rate for it. They were discharged from duty in February, 1655, at which time we may suppose it to have been in a fit condition for service. The inhabitants had so much to do—each on his own homestead—the struggle to obtain the comforts and conveniences of life was so continual and earnest, that public works were long in completion. No man worked at a trade or profession except at intervals; John Elderkin, the meeting-house contractor and mill-wright, had other irons in the fire; a considerable proportion of the work was performed by the inhabitants themselves, in turn, and in this way the progress must be slow. The house was perhaps raised and covered the first year, floored and glazed the next, pulpit and seats made the third—a gallery, it may be, the fourth, and by that time it needed a new covering, or the bounds were too straight, and a lean-to must be added.

At this period the time for service was made known by beat of drum. What was the peculiar beat of the instrument that signified a summons to divine worship, we do not learn; but undoubtedly some difference of stroke and tune distinguished the Sabbath drum from the drum military or civic.

¹ The site was considerably higher than at present, a large quantity of earth and stone having been since taken from this hill to assist in filling up the pond and marsh to form the present Water Street.

" March 22, 1651-2.

" The towne have agreed with Peter Blatchford to beat the drum all sabbath dayes, training dayes and town publique meetings for the sume of 3*lb.*, to be paid him in a towne rate."

Blatchford continued several years in this office. The custom of denoting the hour for public worship by beat of drum, may have continued until a bell was procured, but no allusion to it has been noticed later than 1675.

Though this first meeting-house had no bell, we can not doubt but that it was crowned with that appendage which our ancestors venerated under the name of *steeple*, and which they regarded as an indispensable part of a completed house of worship. The cupola now became the look-out post of the watchman, and this rendered it a useful as well as an ornamental adjunct to the church. The sentinel from this elevated tower commanded a prospect in which the solemnity of the vast wilderness was broken and relieved by touches of great beauty. From the north, came flowing down between wood-land banks, the fair river, which, after spreading into a noble harbor, swept gracefully into the Sound. Following its course outward, the eye glanced easily over a long extent of Long Island, while every sail that passed between that coast and the Connecticut shore, up or down the Sound, might be distinctly seen. Directly beneath lay the young settlement, a rugged, half-cleared promontory, but enlivened with pleasant habitations, and bordered, even then, with those light canvas wings that foreshadowed a thriving commerce.

As a *finale* to the history of the barn so long used for a church, we may here notice a fact gleaned from the county court records of some fifteen or eighteen years' later date. William Rogers, the owner of the building had returned to Boston, and on his death, the heirs of his estate claimed that the *rent* had not been fully paid; and Hugh Caulkins, who had been the town's surety, then a proprietor in Norwich, finds himself suddenly served with a writ from Mr. Leake, a Boston attorney, for £3, 10*s.*, the amount of the debt. He accordingly satisfied the demand, and then applied to the town for redress. The obligation was acknowledged, and a vote passed to indemnify the surety.

" Feb. 27, '72-3.

" Upon demand made by Hugh Calkin for money due to Mr. Leake, of Boston, for improvement of a barn of Goodman Rogers, which said Calkin stood engaged for to pay, this town doth promise to pay one barrel of pork to said Calkin some time the next winter."

On the north of the meeting-house was the lot reserved for purposes of sepulture. The ordinance which describes its bounds, and legally sets it apart for this use, is dated June 6th, 1653, and declares "It shall ever bee for a Common Buriall place, and never be impropriated by any." This is the oldest grave-yard in New London county.

"March 26, 1655.

"Goodman Cumstock is chosen to be grave-maker for the town, and he shal have 4s. for men and women's graves, and for all children's graves, 3s. for every grave he makes."

"Feb. 25, 1661-2. Old Goodman Cumstock is chosen sexton, whose work is to order youth in the meeting-house, sweep the meeting-house, and beat ou dogs, for which he is to have 40s. a year: he is also to make all graves; for a man or woman he is to have 4s., for children, 2s. a grave, to be paid by *survivors*."

In the rear of Meeting-house Hill, was the town pound. The insufficient fencing, and the number of strays, made a *pound* a very necessary appurtenance. Yet it is curious to observe the quantity of legislation which was expended in procuring one. The subject was regularly brought up several times a year, a rate perhaps voted, a person appointed to build the pound and to keep it; yet there was no pound completed till 1663 or 1664. It was then erected "between Goodman Cumstock's and Goodman Waller's," (on Williams Street, corner of Vauxhall,) and here it remained for at least 150 years. The place is still called by the aged, Pound corner.

On Meeting-house Hill also, the first accommodations were provided for prisoners.

"March 10, 1661-2.

"Goodman Longdon is chosen to be the prison-keeper, and his house for the town prison till the town take further order, provision is to be provided by the town, the prisoner being to pay for it with all other charges before he be set free."¹

The earliest notice of Mr. Blinman in this country is from the records of Plymouth colony, March 2d, 1640. This, according to present reckoning, was 1641, but earlier than any vessel could arrive that season, which makes it probable that he came over in 1640.

"Mr. Richard Blindman, Mr. Hugh Prychard, Mr. Obadiah Brewen, John Sadler, Hugh Cauken, Walter Tibbott, propounded for freemanship."

¹ Longdon's house stood near the intersection of Broad and Hempstead streets.

Gov. Winthrop mentions Mr. Blinman's arrival and settlement, without giving the date.

"One Mr. Blinman, a minister in Wales, a godly and able man, came over with some friends of his, and being invited to Green's Harbour, [since Marshfield,] near Plymouth, they went thither, but ere the year was expired there fell out some difference among them, which by no means could be reconciled, so as they agreed to part, and he came with his company and sat down at Cape Anne, which at this court, [May, 1642,] was established to be a plantation, and called Gloucester."¹

The differences alluded to above, between the former settlers and the new comers at Marshfield, appear to have been wholly of a theological nature, and regarded minor points of discipline. From the account given of this affair in the Ecclesiastical History of Massachusetts,² we gather that the main topics on which the two parties disagreed were, the importance of a learned ministry, and how far lay brethren should be encouraged to exercise their gifts in the church. The historian says :

"Mr. Blinman, a gentleman of Wales, and a preacher of the gospel, was one who expected to find a welcome reception. Being invited to Green's Harbour, near Plymouth, he and his friends meant there to settle, but the influence of a few gifted brethren made learning or prudence of little avail. They compared him 'to a piece of new cloth in an old garment,' and thought they could do better without patching. The old and new planters, to speak a more modern style, could not agree and parted."

The church record of Plymouth in speaking of Marshfield, has this remark :

"This church of Marshfield was begun and afterward carried on by the help and assistance, under God, of Mr. Edward Winslow, who at the first procured several Welsh gentlemen of good note thither, with Mr. Blinman, a godly, able minister."³

Another original notice of this divine is in Lechford's Plain Dealing, written in 1641. It has a savor, as might be expected, of the bitterness of that author.

"Master Wilson did lately ride to Green's Harbour, in Plymouth patent, to appease a broyle betweone one master Thomas, as I take it his name is, and master Blindman, where master Blindman went by the worst."⁴

¹ Sav. Winthrop, vol. 2, p. 64.

² Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st series, vol. 9, p. 89.

³ Davis, Morton's Memorial, p. 416.

⁴ Mass. Hist. Coll., 8d series, vol. 3, p. 106.

It is an inquiry of some interest to the genealogist, who composed that Welsh party which came over with Mr. Blinman. It is fair to presume that a considerable number of his fellow-passengers settled with him at Green Harbor, and subsequently removed with him in a body to Cape Ann. Thither therefore we must follow them. On that billowy mass of rocks, that promontory so singularly bold in position and outline, and so picturesque in appearance, they fixed their second encampment in this new world.

The following slip from the town records of Gloucester may indicate several of the Welsh party.

"2 May, '42. On the first ordering and disposing of the affairs of Gloucester by Mr. Endicott and Mr. Downing, these eight were chosen to manage the prudential affairs.

Wm. Steevens,	Mr. Bruen,
Wm. Addis,	Mr. Norton,
Mr. Milwood,	Mr. Fryer,
Mr. Saddler,	Walter Tybbot."

It is not necessary to suppose that all the names of Mr. Blinman's party should be of Welsh origin. They came from Chepstow, in Monmouthshire; a county which is now considered a part of England proper, though it lies upon the border of Wales, and formerly was reckoned to belong to that country. The Welsh language is said to prevail among the common people of that shire, but it is certain that Mr. Blinman's party spoke good English, though sprinkled of course with some provincialisms. This fact affords sufficient proof, either that they were not Welshmen in the accurate sense of the term, or that they belonged to that more enlightened portion of the inhabitants who used the English language.

In point of fact, it was not the peasantry of Great Britain, nor her paupers, nor her fortune-hunters, that founded New England. It was her staunch yeomanry, her intelligent mechanics, her merchants, her farmers, her middle classes—and of devout women not a few—whose enlarged vision beheld a realm of freedom beyond the ocean, and whose independent spirits disdained the yoke of oppression, were it to be imposed either on the soul or the body. The character of our country might have been very different had her pioneer settlers, or even their patrons and directors, been the younger sons of the gentry, or disappointed placemen, importunate suitors, and their servile followers. An active husbandman fearing God, or a sturdy

blacksmith, honest and independent, exercising at once his reason, his electoral right, and his sledge hammer, is better than a hundred pensioned lords to be the founder of a town, or the father of a race.

Mr. Blinman may have been himself a native of Gloucestershire, which joins Monmouth where he had preached. The settlement at Cape Ann was probably named Gloucester in compliment to him. When he finally left America, and returned to England, it was to Bristol (which is in the county of Gloucester) that he retired, as to an ancient home which in all his wanderings had never been forgotten. People are often found returning to the scenes of early days to die. There is a natural attachment in man to his birth-place, which in most cases renders it pleasing to him to lie down in his grave near the place where his cradle was rocked.

That Mr. Blinman was a native of Gloucester, England, rests, however, only on supposition and probability. In the new Gloucester he resided about eight years. The records of the town give no particular account of his ministry, nor of the causes which led him to remove to New London. He was probably unmarried when he came to America. In the registry of births in Gloucester is the following record.

" Children of Mr. Richard Blinman and his wife Mary :

Jeremiah born 20 July, 1642.

Ezekiel " 10 Nov. 1643.

Azarikam " 2 Jan. 1646."¹

Johnson, in his Wonder-working Providence, which was written apparently while Mr. Blinman was at Gloucester, has this account of him and the origin of the church at that place.

" There was another town and church of Christ erected in the Mattachuset Government upon the northern Cape of the Bay, called Cape Ann, a place of fishing, being peopled with fishermen, till the reverend Mr. Richard Blinman, came from a place in Plimouth Patten, called Green Harbour, with some few people of his acquaintance and settled down with them, named the town Gloucester, and gathered into a Church, being but a small number, about 50 persons, they called to office this godly reverend man, whose gifts and abilities to handle the word, is not inferior to many others, laboring much against the errors of the times, of a sweet, humble, heavenly carriage."²

¹ In this name there is a superfluous letter. Azrikam is a proper Hebrew name, found in Scripture, and signifying, " A help against the enemy."

² Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 7, p. 82.

In the verse that follows, he probably alludes to Mr. Blinman's proposed removal to Pequot.

"Blinman be blith in him, who thee hath taken
To feed his flock, a few poor scattered sheep,
Why should they be of thee at all forsaken,
Thy honor's high, that any thou may'st keep."

The first notice of Mr. Blinman's arrival at New London, (then Pequot) is his appearance at a town meeting in November, 1650. Several of his ancient flock accompanied or followed him in this new emigration. Obadiah Bruen, Hugh Caulkins, William Hough and James Morgan were perhaps of this number. Robert Parke, William Addis, and several others, who settled in the place at a later date, are conjectured to have belonged originally to the same party.

Of Mr. Blinman's ministerial labors here, no record has been preserved; not a single contemporaneous allusion can be found to his capacity, or to the result of his labors in that department. We have reason to infer however, that he was acceptable to the people, and that his intercourse with them was entirely harmonious. His grants of land were almost innumerable; and his applications for grants either for himself or others, were responded to with liberality. Yet his disposition was evidently generous, not grasping. A proof of this is exhibited in his voluntary release of the town from their engagement to increase his salary annually:

"Feb. 25, 1653. Forasmuch as the town was ingaged to Mr. Blynman for a set stypend and soe to increase it yearly Mr. Blynman is freely willing to free the towne henceforward from that ingadgement."

It is not known that Mr. Blinman was ever inducted into office, or that any church organization took place under his ministry. Yet he is uniformly styled "pastor of the church," which is strong evidence that a church association of some kind had been formed in the town. His reasons for leaving the church and the country are entirely unknown. Not a word of dispraise uttered against him from any individual is preserved, except the hasty insinuation of Capt. Denison heretofore mentioned, which he publicly recalled. The period when he relinquished his charge can be very nearly ascertained, for in Jan., 1657-8, he uses the customary formula, "I, Richard Blinman of Pequot," and in March of the same year, "I, R. B., at present of New Haven."

Proofs of his liberality and kindness of heart occasionally gleam

upon us, showing that a free and loving intercourse was kept up between him and friends left behind. April 27th, 1658, he writes from New Haven: "Loving friend, Mr. Morton—I do approve of my wife's sale of that lot," &c.

April 26th, he executes a deed of gift of two pieces of land:

"To the honored John Winthrop Esq. Governor upon Connecticut, in trust for the use of Mrs. Elizabeth Winthrop, the wife of the said John Winthrop and her heirs."

Most of his land on the General Neck, and at Upper Mamacock, he sold to James Rogers and to the bill of sale he adds: "I do hope it may be a blessing to you and yours."

He also conveyed a piece of land as a gift to Samuel Beeby, and another to Mr. William Thomson, the Indian teacher; the latter in the following terms:

"Loving friend Mr. Thomson.

"I was bold by brother Parkes formerly to tender a small gift to you, viz. a piece of land and swamp which was given me for a wood lot lying towards the west side of William Cumstock's hill, which if you please to accept as a token of my love I do freely give and confirm it to you.

"Your loving friend,

Richard Blinman.

New Haven, April 11, 1659."

Soon after this last date, Mr. Blinman came to New London to settle some remaining affairs, and to embark with his family for England, by way of Newfoundland. His house and house lot he sold to William Addis, and his farm at Harbor's Mouth to John Tinker. The witnesses to this last deed were Samuel Rogers and Ezekiel Blinman. This is the only glimpse we obtain of Mr. Blinman's second son in this country. In this deed the form used, is, "I, Richard Blinman, late pastor of the church of Christ, at New London."

A deed to Andrew Lester, and settlement of accounts with James Rogers, were dated 12th of July. He sailed shortly afterward. The Rev. John Davenport, of New Haven, in writing to Mr. Winthrop, mentions that he had received from Mr. Blinman "a large letter," dated at Newfoundland, August 22d, 1659, and adds:

"Whereby I understand that God hath brought him and his to Newfoundland, in safety and health, and maketh his ministry acceptable to all the people there, except some Quakers, and much desired and flocked unto, and he

hath made choice of a ship for Barnstaple, to his content, the master being godly."

The farms of Mr. Blinman at Pine Neck and Fort Hill were not sold when he left the country. They were afterward purchased by Christopher Christophers, and the deed of conveyance is from

"I, Richard Blinman, with Mary my wife, now dwelling in the castle, in the city of Bristol, England."

"10 Jan. 1670-1."

Mr. Blinman's successor at Green's Harbor, Marshfield, was Mr. Edward Bulkley: at New London, Mr. Gershom Bulkley. There is this coincidence in the annals of the two places, that the first ministers of each were Blinman and Bulkley.

Mr. Blinman's oldest son, Jeremiah, or Jeremy, did not leave the country with his father. His name occurs occasionally for several years afterward. In 1663 he was plaintiff in an action of debt, *versus* John Raymond; and about that period incurred, by judgment of the county court, the penalty of £5, which was the usual fine for a violation of the laws of purity.

CHAPTER VIII.

A CHAPTER OF NAMES—ENGLISH AND ABORIGINAL.

“THE Indian name of New London,” says Trumbull, “was Na-meaug, alias Towawog.” The first was undoubtedly the prevalent name: it was used, with many variations in the spelling, to designate both the site of the town and the natives found upon it. The Indian names are all descriptive, and this is supposed to mean a fishing place, being compounded of *Namas*,¹ *fish*, and *eag*, *gug*, *eak*, terminations which signify *land*.

The other name, *Tawaw-wog*, is not often found on record: it occurs however, as an alias, in several deeds,² about the date of 1654. It is probable that this also has a reference to *fish*; and may be derived from *Tataug* or *Tatau-og*, *black-fish*, for which the neighboring waters are still renowned.

The minutes heretofore quoted show conclusively that it was the wish of the first settlers, the fathers of the plantation, that their adopted home should bear the name of London. This was no suggestion of vainglory, the result of a high-wrought expectation of rivaling the metropolitan splendor of Great Britain; but a very natural mode of expressing their deep-rooted affection for the land of their birth. The General Court hesitated in regard to this name, and proposed *Fair Harbor*, as a more appropriate term. But the inhabitants declined the proposition, and resolved to adhere to the old Indian name, until they could obtain the one of their choice.

The Legislature at length yielded to their wishes, and legalized

1 *Namsu-us*, *fish*, R. Williams.

2 A few examples, all from the handwriting of Mr. Bruen, will show the variations of orthography in these names: “Thomas Parke of the towne of Pequott otherwise called Nameeg or Tawaw-wag.” (1658.) “Samuell Lothrop of the towne of Pequot (alias Nameeg and Tawaw-og.” (1654.) “Richard Blinman, pastor of the church at Pequot, (otherwise called Nameeg and Tawaw-wog.”)

the favorite name of the inhabitants, by an act of March 24th, 1658, expressed in the following gracious and acceptable terms :

"Whereas it hath been a commendable practice of the inhabitants of all the colonies of these parts, that as this country hath its denomination from our dear native country of England, and thence is called New England ; so the planters, in their first settling of most new plantations, have given names to those plantations of some cities and towns in England, thereby intending to keep up and leave to posterity the memorial of several places of note there, as *Boston, Hartford, Windsor, York, Ipswich, Braintree, Exeter*. This court considering, that there hath yet no place in any of the colonies, been named in memory of the city of London, there being a new plantation within this jurisdiction of Connecticut, settled upon the fair river of Monhegin, in the Pequot country, it being an excellent harbour and a fit and convenient place for future trade, it being also the only place which the English of these parts have possessed by conquest, and that by a very just war, upon that great and warlike people, the Pequots, that therefore, they might thereby leave to posterity the memory of that renowned city of London, from whence we had our transportation, have thought fit, in honor to that famous city, to call the said plantation **NEW LONDON.**"¹

At what period "*the fair river of Monhegin*," received its present designation, *the Thames*, is uncertain. Neither the colonial records, nor those of the town, enable us to fix the period. The proper name given by the Indians to this river, has unfortunately been lost. The English settlers called it from the tribes on its banks, "the Mohiganic River," or river of Mohegan ; the Pequot, or river of the Pequots. We have seen that the Dutch explorers conferred upon it the names of Frisius, and Little Fresh River. In singular opposition to this name, the early planters of the town called it the *Great River*. This term, used as a proper name, is found on a large number of grants and deeds. It was used by Winthrop and others in the beginning of the plantation, and for many years afterward. Jonathan Brewster, the town-clerk of 1650, called it "the Great River of Pequett." The reason is not obvious ; for persons acquainted with the Connecticut and the Hudson, would never have termed it Great, in the absolute sense, and there was no stream near, of larger size than brooks and rivulets, to suggest a comparison. May it not have been like others of our names, a translation of the aboriginal term ? Savages are ever boastful ; and to the Pequots and Mohegans, here was

¹ Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 318. The name sometimes appears in old records without the prefix of *New*. A grant of the Legislature in 1659, mentions "the plantation of London."

the *one great river*—the river of a great people—of the god Saseacous and his unconquerable warriors.

Allowing probability to this suggestion, we are next led to inquire, what was that native term which implied Great River. Pleasant indeed would it be to recover the aboriginal name of our beloved Thames. The western branch of the river was called by the natives Yantuck or Yantic, a word which is supposed to mean a rapid, roaring stream.¹ This signification is peculiarly appropriate; for the river, though small, is swift and noisy, and near its mouth, being compressed between high cliffs, and obstructed by a rugged ledge of granite, it works its way through the fissures, tumbling with noise and foam, into a smooth estuary or basin, by the side of which was a famous Indian landing, or canoe-place. This fall, the distinguishing feature of the river and of its neighborhood, would be the first to attract the notice of the savage, the first object to be named, and its name the one to which others might be referred and compared. Thus the river took the name of the water-fall and was called the Yantuck; then the larger river into which it flowed, would be the Mishí (great) or Masha-yantuck, euphonized into Mashantuck, and signifying the Great Yantuck. This, we venture to propose as the aboriginal name of the Thames. But it is offered as a suggestion, not an assertion. As all Indian names are significant, and we have scarcely anything else to remind us of this vanishing race, the older children of the land we inhabit, it can not be deemed idle or impertinent to preserve what we have, and to recover all we can, of these fading memorials.

This word Mashantuck, with the syllable *kuk*, added, which in the Indian language designates a hill-top, or headland, might naturally be applied to the rugged, hilly country upon the river. For, among the Indians, as well as among civilized nations, it was no strange thing for the name of a river to be extended over the adjacent country, or on the other hand, for the name of the country to overshadow the river. In point of fact the name Mashantakuk, with its variations, Mashantucket² and Mishantuxet, was applied by the natives to the western bank of the river, or certain portions of it. In a deed from Uncas and his sons to John Mason in 1671, Mashantakuk is used as a general name for the whole Mohegan reservation. Shan-

¹ Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

² The suffix *et* appears to be a terminal sound without signification.

tok, a name still given to a portion of Mohegan, bordering on the river, is probably an abbreviation of the same word.

Most of the local names adopted at the first settlement, have been preserved with remarkable pertinacity. Trading Cove, Long Cove, Little Cove, the Straits' Mouth, Massapeag and Mamacock—all in the river; Fog Plain, Mile Plain, X Plain, Flat Rock, Great Hill, Ridge Hill, Mullein Hill, Pine Neck, Wigwamps, Log-bridge Hill, (now Loggy Hill,) west of the town; Winthrop's Neck and Cove, Bream Cove, Green Harbor, Goshen Neck, Alewife Cove—are names that were all in use before 1660, and most of them in 1652. What is now Niantic Bridge was at first known as "Gutt Ferry," and after 1790, as Rope Ferry, which is still in use. Gardiner's Island was Isle of Wight, and Plum Island (rather later) Isle of Patmos. Nassau Island, as a name for Long Island, appears on deeds between 1690 and 1700. Great and Little Gull Islands were undoubtedly so named on account of the sea-gulls that here had their haunts, and whitened the shore with the abundance of their eggs. The Indians had probably named them from the same striking circumstance, and this Indian name, it is conjectured, was identical with that given to a point on the Stonington coast—Wampassok or Wampashok—a name supposed to signify *a white land*, or a land frequented by white birds.¹

One of the islets in the river just below Fort Trumbull was very early known as Nicholl's Cod, perhaps from William Nicholls an early settler: the other at a later period was called Powder Island. Bartlet's Reef, south-west of the mouth of the river, may have had its name from William or Robert Bartlet, who were coasters or shippers on the coast before 1660. This however is not certainly known.

Bachelor's Cove and Jupiter Point, on the Groton shore, were names used in 1653, but can not now be located. Latham's Chair, a cluster of rocks, in the mouth of the river, near Eastern Point, is laid down on charts.

Cohanzie (a district in Waterford) is not on record before 1750, but may have been familiarly used at an earlier date. Its origin is not known, but in all probability it is a modification of some Indian name. According to tradition it is derived from an old Pequot who

¹ *Wampi*, white; *Wampashok*, a species of wild goose, and probably applied to other birds of white plumage. *Wompessacuck*, "white head birds,"—a name given to the eagle. See Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 4, p. 275.

had a wigwam in a dense swamp in the district, where he dwelt and made brooms and baskets for his neighbors, long after all others of his race had disappeared from the neighborhood.

Cedar Swamp, Ash Swamp, Owl Swamp, and other swamps of the neighborhood, all at different periods have enjoyed the reputation of being haunted—not generally, however, by ghosts of the dead, but by living bugbears—such as old Indians, deserters from English ships, witches, and trampers. That species of tradition which is founded upon deeds of murder and violence, has never gained much of a foothold in this vicinity. The Ash Swamp ghost was perhaps an exception, though the legend appears to have faded from memory: it was the apparition of a woman that always appeared with a white apron over her head, so that her face was never seen. A ghost was at one time in the last century said to haunt the vicinity of Mile Brook, where belated travelers were sure to find an old woman employed in letting down bars that constantly replaced themselves, as they fell from her hand.

The following Indian names belong to the original Pequot or Mohegan territory. A part of them are still in use: the others have been gleaned from records or tradition.

Cow-waus, a rugged tract of land lying west of the Mohegan or Norwich road. It is the Indian word for pine-tree and designated a locality where pines were found. *Cowassit*, the Indian name of Blackwell's Brook, that flows into the Quinebaug in Canterbury, and *Covissatuck*, in the north-east part of Stonington, are words of the same origin.

Gungewamps, a high, rugged hill three and a half miles north-east of Groton Ferry.

Magunk, a locality on the Great Neck, formerly so called. It may mean a *large tree*. *Magunkahquog*, the Indian name of Hopkinton, Mass., is said to signify, *a place of great trees*.

Mamacock, the neck of land on which Fort Trumbull is situated; also a neck of land two miles higher up the river. R. Williams defines *Maumacock* “a point of land bending like a hook.”

Mashapaug, now Gardiner's Lake. It was in the north-west corner of the ancient bounds of New London and the south-west corner of ancient Norwich. The English called it at first, “20-mile-pond.” It appears to mean simply Great Pond. Other sheets of water in New England bore the same name.

Massa-peag; probably a word of the same origin and significance as the foregoing. It is the name of a large cove running into

Mohegan from the river, six miles north of New London and so inclosed by the land as to resemble a pond. The banks of the cove bear the same name. It was sometimes written Mashpeage.

Massa-wamasog, a brook and cove in Mohegan, north of Massapeag.

Manatuck, a high, bold hill-top, in Waterford, commanding a fine view of the Sound. The word may perhaps be of the same origin as Montauk.

Mistuckset, a brook in Stonington forming a boundary of land at Quonaduck, granted to Amos Richardson in 1653.

Mystic: this name is similar to the foregoing. It is undoubtedly the true aboriginal name of the river, and not brought, as some have supposed, by the English settlers, from the Mystic which flows into Boston Bay. Roger Williams calls it *Mistick* before the Pequot War. There is probably some natural feature common to the two rivers which suggested the name. It is now usually written without the k—Mystic.

Namucksuck. Samuel Lathrop's farm, on the west bank of Pequot River, four or five miles from New London, was said to be at Namucksuck.

Nantneag. Winthrop sent to Sir Hans Sloane a specimen of a new mineral, which he says was found "at Nantneag, three miles from New London." The mineral received the name of Columbinum. No place in the vicinity is now known as Nantneag.

Naiwayonk or *Nowayunck*, now abbreviated to Noank, a peninsula at the mouth of Mystic River, on the west side. Cassasinamon's party of Pequot Indians was collected on this peninsula very soon after the settlement of New London, and remained here till about 1667, when they were removed to Mashantucket. A thriving and picturesque village is now spread over the rugged ledges of Noank.

Nayantick or *Nahantick*: Roger Williams wrote Nayantaquit; other variations are numerous. It is now commonly written Niantic. The bar at Rope Ferry (south-west extremity of Waterford) was probably the original western Nahantick, and Watch Hill Neck, or the south-west part of Westerly, the eastern Nahantick. Nahantick is the same word as Nahant and apparently designates a long, sandy point or beach: the syllable *ick* is probably expletive.

Oxo-paug-suck. This rugged Indian word has been transmuted by custom into one much more barbarous, viz., Oxy-boxy. It designated a small pond in the north parish of New London (now Montville) and a wild, dashing brook which issued from it and flowed

south-east into the Thames. In the lower part of its course the stream was called by the Indians Cochikuack and by the English Saw-mill Brook. Its banks are in many places very bold and romantic. A series of mills and factories (twelve in number) now occupy the choice positions on its course, and a village remarkably picturesque and umbrageous has grown up near its mouth, which is called Uncasville.

Poquetannuck, a river and cove on the east side of the Thames, where Brewster's trading-house was situated. The name is still retained and designates also a pleasant village through which the stream flows. Two definitions, of directly opposite import, may be suggested for this word: a fact which illustrates the difficulty of fixing the signification of Indian names. *Poqua*, it is said, signifies *an oak*, and *Poqua-tannock* is, then, a place where there are many oak-trees, a forest of oaks. Again, *poqua* signifies *open*, and places with that prefix denote open fields or cleared grounds. *Poquetannuck*, then, means *a place free from all trees*.

Poquaug, or more properly *Poquyogh*, a small bay or cove, between two and three miles west of the mouth of the Thames. The word may be derived from *Pequaw-hock* or *Quaw-haug*, the name of the large round clam, which was very abundant in this vicinity. The English at first called it Robin Hood's Bay, but this name was soon dropped and that of *Jordan* substituted; which name now designates the cove, the brook flowing into it, and the adjoining district. It was probably bestowed by some devout proprietor in honor of the Jordan of Palestine.

Shinicosset, in Groton, east side of the harbor's mouth.

Sepos-tamesuck, a cove and brook in Mohegan, west side of the river.

Swichichog, a rocky point in Mohegan, west side of the river. *Swegotchy*, west side of Niantic Bay: perhaps both have some reference to *saquish*, *saquishog*, clams.

Tauba-konomok, a high hill in the western part of Waterford, overlooking Lake's Pond: now abridged to *Konom'ok*. It is mentioned in a town act of March 14th, 1693-4.

"Then voted that the land lying between Popple-swamp and Taba-cono-mock hill shall be and remain for the town's use forever common."

Uhuhihoh, written also *Uhuoigh*, *Whoohyoh*, and sometimes the last letter *k*. This name was applied to Jordan Brook where it falls into the cove and to the swampy thickets on its borders. The sound

so much resembles the hooting of an owl as to suggest the idea that the name was derived from that bird. The Mohegan word for owl was, however, *Kookoo-ky-om*; and we hazard, as a more pleasing conjecture, that it was the Indian word for the whippowil, and so named on account of the woods and brakes in the vicinity having been noted retreats of this interesting night-warbler. Using what is called in the notation of Indian languages the whistled *w*, it would be written *W'uhioh*.¹ May not the name of the fair river of the west, Ohio, have a similar origin?

Wikopasset or *Weekopeesuck*, a small island at the north-east end of Fisher's Island.

Wee-powaug, a place north of Brewster's farm at Poquetannuck, where Uncas gave to John Picket six or seven hundred acres of land. It fell to his son-in-law Charles Hill.²

1 Heckwelder and Duponceau would probably have given it this orthography.

2 Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 2, p. 142.

CHAPTER IX.

Uncas at variance with the English.—Repeatedly invaded by the Narragansetts.—Incident at Brewster's Neck.—Efforts to instruct the Indians by Blinman, Thompson, Minor and Stanton.—Removal and settlement of the two bands of Pequots.

THE Mohegans and the planters at Pequot continued to be for several years troublesome neighbors to each other. The sachem was ever complaining of encroachments upon his royalties and the English farmers of Indian aggressions upon their property. In March, 1653-4, the planters, apparently in some sudden burst of indignation, made an irruption into the Indian territory and took possession of

“Uncas his fort, and many of his wigwams at Monheag,”¹

The sachem, as usual, carried his grievances to Hartford; and the General Court ordered a letter of inquiry and remonstrance to be written to the town. This was followed by the appointment of a committee, Major Mason, Matthew Griswold and Mr. Winthrop, to review the boundary line between the plantation and the Indians and to “endeavor to compose differences between Pequett and Uncas in love and peace.”² This appears to have quieted the present uneasiness, and for several succeeding years the enmity of the Narragansetts furnished the sachem with a motive to conciliate the English.

Between 1640 and 1660 he was repeatedly invaded by hostile bands of his own race, that swept over him like the gust of a whirlwind and drove him for refuge into some stone fort or gloomy Cappa-

¹ Conn. Col. Rec., vol. I, p. 251.

² *Ul supra*, p. 257.

cummock.¹ It is wonderful that he should always have escaped from an enmity so deadly and unremitting, and that he should have increased in numbers and strength while so frequently engaged in hostilities.

In 1657, the Narragansetts, taking their usual route through the wilderness, and crossing the fords of the Shetucket and Yantic, poured down upon Mohegan, marking their course with slaughter and devastation.² Uncas fled before them, and took refuge in a fort at the head of Nahantick River, where his enemies closely besieged him. It is probable that he would soon have been obliged to submit to terms, had not his English neighbors hastened to his relief. Lieut. James Avery, Mr. Brewster, Richard Haughton, Samuel Lothrop and others well armed, succeeded in throwing themselves into the fort; and the Narragansetts, fearing to engage in a conflict with the English, broke up the siege and returned home. Major Mason, the patron of Uncas, hastened to lay before the General Court an account of the danger to which he had been exposed.³ The Legislature approved of the measures that had been taken for his protection, and requested Mr. Brewster to leave a few men in the fortress with Uncas, to defend him, if again he should be assaulted, and to keep a strict watch over the Narragansetts.

The commissioners who met at Boston in September, took a different view of the case. They had come to the determination of leaving the Indians to fight their own battles, and therefore disapproved of the interference of the English in favor of Uncas. A letter was forthwith dispatched to Pequot directing Mr. Brewster and the others, in Nahantick fort, to retire immediately to their own dwellings, and leave Uncas to manage his affairs himself. For the time to come, they prohibited any interference in the quarrels of Indians with one another, either by colonies or individuals, except in cases of necessary self-defense.

The next year Uncas was again invaded by the Narragansetts, and with them—united against their common enemy—came the Pokomticks and other tribes belonging to Connecticut River. The English did not always escape annoyance from these marauding parties.

1 This name probably refers to an islet in a swamp.

2 "The Narragansetts killed and took captive diverse of his men and seized much of his goods." Hazard, vol. 2.

3 Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 1, pp. 301, 302.

Mr. Brewster preferred a complaint to the commissioners at their next meeting, that the invaders

"Killed an Indian employed in his service, and flying to Mistress Brewster for succor; yet they violently took him from her, and shot him by her side to her great affrightment."¹

This incident undoubtedly occurred on Brewster's Neck at Poquettannuck. The Indians in their defense said that the Mohegans, their enemies, took shelter in Mr. Brewster's house and were there protected; that Mr. Brewster and Mr. Thompson supplied them with guns, powder and shot; that being on the west side of the river, they were shot at by two men from the east side, whereupon their young warriors crossed the stream, and not finding the offenders, concluded they had taken shelter in the house, and pursued them thither. This defense had but little weight with the commissioners; who amerced the offending Indians in 120 fathoms of wampum.

The repeated invasion of his enemies drove Uncas for a time from his residence in Mohegan proper. He sheltered himself for two or three years within the circle of the English settlements, and dwelt at Nahantick, at Black Point, and even west of Saybrook, on lands claimed by him at Killingworth and Branford. It was not till after the settlement of Norwich in 1660, that he once more established himself in his old home.

The migratory habits of the Indians, who seldom spent summer and winter in the same place, will account in some degree for their wide-spread claims of possession. Foxen, the friend and counselor of Uncas has left his name indelibly impressed in the neighborhood of New London and on the plains of East Haven.² This fact alone would show the extent of the Mohegan right of dominion; or rather of the Pequot right, to which the Mohegans succeeded.

In 1657, the court of commissioners, acting as agents to the "Society for propagating the Gospel in New England," proposed to Mr. Blinman to become the missionary of the Pequots and Mohegans, offering a salary of £20 *per annum*, and pay for an interpreter. Mr. Blinman declined; and the same year Mr. William Thomson,³ a graduate of Harvard College, and son of the first minister of Braintree, Mass., was engaged for the office. His salary from the

¹ Records of the Commissioners, in Hazard, vol. 2.

² East Haven Register, p. 18.

³ This is his own orthography: Farmer in his Register writes it Tompson.

commissioners was £10 *per annum*, for the first two years, and £20 *per annum*, for the next two; but after 1661 the stipend was withheld, with the remark, that he had "neglected the business." His services were confined entirely to the Pequots at Mystic and Pawkatuck.¹ Uncas uniformly declined all offers of introducing religious instruction among his people. Mr. Thomson left New London in feeble health in 1663, and in September, 1664, was in Surry county, Virginia.

The commissioners made many praiseworthy attempts to obtain regular religious instruction for the Pequots, but met with only partial success. In 1654, they selected John the son of Thomas Minor and proposed to educate him for an Indian teacher. John the son of Thomas Stanton was also received by them for the same purpose. They were both kept at school and college for two or three years; but the young men ultimately left their studies and devoted themselves to other pursuits.

The remnant of the Pequots not amalgamated with the Mohegans were principally collected into two bands: one of them lived on or near the Mystic, having Cassasinamon (called by the English Robin) for their chief; the other, on or near the Pawkatuck, under Cashawasset (or Harmon Garrett.) These miserable fragments of a tribe for many years annually sent their plea to the court of commissioners asking for more land. Their situation was indeed pitiable. The English crowded them on every side. Their corn was often ruined by the breaking in of wild horses, and loose cattle and swine; and they were not allowed to fish, or hunt, or trespass in any manner upon lands claimed either by Uncas or by the English. Toward these people, the commissioners in 1658 and onward appear to have been kindly disposed. They repeatedly granted them certain tracts of land and appointed persons to see to their removal and accommodation. In 1663, they wrote letters to the towns of New London and Southerton requiring them immediately to lay out those lands which had been granted to the Indians, "anno 58." Even this imperative proceeding led to no immediate result. It was the favorite plan of the Connecticut authorities, to settle the Pequots at Mohegan, under the sway of Uncas, and they consented with reluctance that they should remain a distinct community. Mr. Winthrop,

¹ Mr. Thomson had a farm at Mystic, but his residence was in the town plot, on what is now Manwaring's Hill. His house was sold when he left the town, to Oliver Manwaring.

Capt. Denison, Capt. James Avery, and some other men of influence, dissented from these views and labored for the accommodation of the Pequots.

In 1664, the commissioners referred the charge and responsibility of removing the Indians to the Connecticut delegation. After a further struggle of three years with various contending parties, the object was accomplished. The Connecticut committee report in 1667:

"As for the Pequot Indians they are settled on a large tract of land for their planting and subsistence, which we wish had been sooner attended, but being now effected, we hope will satisfy our confederates."

This refers to the Mystic Indians, who were removed to the interior of the northern part of the plantation, and settled on a reservation of two thousand acres, called Mashantucket, a name probably transferred from the Mohegan reserved lands west of the river,¹ to which it had been previously applied. Cassasinamon² remained the ruler or governor of this party until his death in 1692. Other nominal chiefs of their own people followed, but the actual direction of their affairs, down to the present day, has been intrusted to agents, appointed by the legislature.

The removal and settlement of Harmon Garrett's company was attended with yet more difficulty.³ They were ultimately settled, and probably about 1670, on a reservation a few miles east of Mashantucket, in what is now North Stonington. Harmon Garret, otherwise called Wequash-kook, and sometimes Cashawasset, died in 1675 or 1676. Momoho succeeded and died in 1695. Both of these Pequot bands remained faithful to the English in Philip's War and performed good service.

1 In like manner the name Nameug, or Nameak, had been applied to the place where they dwelt at Mystic.

2 One would like to know whether the wit of this tawny chieftain were as *spicy* as his name. Cassia-cinnamon—how pungent and aromatic!

3 See Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series, vol. 10, pp. 64-69, where are letters to Gov. Winthrop on the Pequot business, from Capt. Denison and Mr. James Noyes, which show that even candid and honest men may take different views of the same subject. Denison pleads for the Indians with an eloquence and ardor highly honorable to him.

CHAPTER X.

Town affairs, civil and ecclesiastical, from 1661 to 1671.—Extracts from the Moderator's minutes, with explanations and comments.—Ministry of Mr. Bulkley and Mr. Bradstreet.—First church formed.—First ordination.

THE year 1661 presents us with a new minister. Mr. Gershom Bulkley, of Concord, in the Bay colony, having preached several months in the place, entered into a contract to become the minister of the town. This was merely an engagement for a term of years, and contained no reference to a settlement or ordination. The town pledged a salary of £80 yearly for three years, and afterward more, if the people found themselves able to give more, or "as much more as God shall move their hearts to give, and they do find it needful to be paid." It was to be reckoned in provisions or English goods; and for the first three years he was to have "all such silver as is weekly contributed by strangers, to help towards the buying of books." The town was to pay for the transportation of himself, family and effects from Concord; provide him with a dwelling-house, orchard, garden and pasture, and with upland and meadow for a small farm; supply him yearly with fire-wood for the use of his family, and "do their endeavor to suit him with a servant-man or youth, and a maid, he paying for their time." Finally, if Mr. Bulkley should die during the continuance of his ministry, his wife and children should receive from the town "the full and just sum of £60 sterling."

This contract was afterward modified. To obviate some difficulty which occurred in building the parsonage, Mr. Bulkley proposed to provide himself with a house, and free the town from the engagement to pay £60 to his family in case of his decease, for the sum of £80 in hand. To this the town consented on condition that he remained with them seven years, but they added this clause.

"In case he remove before the 7 yeer, he is to return the 80*l.* agen, but if he stay the 7 yeere out, the 80*l.* is wholly given him, or if God take him away before this tyme of 7 yeeres, the whole is given his wife and children."

Mr. Bulkley was a son of the Rev. Peter Bulkley, first minister of Concord, Mass. His mother, the second wife of his father, was Grace, daughter of Sir Richard Chitwood. It has been often related concerning this lady, that she apparently died on her passage to this country. Her husband supposing land to be near, and unwilling to consign the beloved form to a watery grave, urgently entreated the captain that the body might be kept one day more, and yet another and another day; to which, as no signs of decay had appeared, he consented. On the third day symptoms of vitality were observed, and before they reached the land, animation, so long suspended, was restored; and though carried from the vessel an invalid, she recovered and lived to old age. Her son, Gershom, was born soon after their arrival, Dec. 26th, 1635. He graduated at Harvard College, in 1655, and married, Oct. 26th, 1659, Sarah Chauncey, daughter of the president of that institution. His father died in 1659. His widowed mother, Mrs. Grace Bulkley, followed her son to New London, where she purchased the homestead of William Hough, "hard below the meeting-house that now is," and dwelt in the town, a householder, so long as her son remained its minister.

Mr. Bulkley, after having freed the town from their engagement to build a parsonage, purchased the homestead of Samuel Lothrop, who was about removing to the new settlement of Norwich. The house is said to have stood beyond the bridge, over the mill brook, on the east side of the highway toward Mohegan. Here Mr. Bulkley dwelt during his residence in New London.¹

Minutes from the Moderator's book.

"Mr. Thomson to be cleared"—(freed from paying rates.)

"Mr. Tinker, James Morgan, and Obadiah Bruen, are chosen to seat the people in the meeting-house, which, they doing, the inhabitants are to rest silent."

"Dec. 1, 1661. The towne have agreed with Goodman Elderkin and Goodman Waller to repare the turret of the meeting-house, and to pay them what they shall demand in reason."

"To know what allowance Mr. Tinker shall have for his tyme spent in exercising in publicke.

"To return an account of contributions.

"May 5, 1662. Thomas Bowen hath given him by the towne forty shillings of the contribution wompum."

¹ Probably where is now the Hallam house, late the residence of the aged sisters, Mrs. Thomas Poole and Mrs. Robert Hallam.

Why Thomas Bowen should receive a part of the money given for ecclesiastical purposes is not explained. He had dwelt but a short time in the place, and very soon removed to Rehoboth, where he died in 1663. Mr. Tinker is supposed to have led the public worship before Mr. Bulkley's arrival. The town voted him a compensation of £6. He was rate-maker, collector and commissioner for the year 1662, and also an assistant of the colony.

"Jan. 6, 1661-2.

"The highway to the water by Mr. Morton's is voated to be 4 pole wide."
[Now Blinman street.]

"All the military offisers are to lay out fort hill by the next meeting."

Fort Hill was an elevated upland ridge on the eastern border of the present Parade, with an abrupt projecting slope to the water side, which caused it to be called also a point. In the course of time it has been graded and rounded, so as to be no longer either a hill or a point. It was expressly reserved on the first laying out of the town, for the purpose of fortification.

"Sept. '61.

"Mr. Thomsons request of 3 pole of land by the water side upon Mill Cove."

"Oct. 24. Mr. Lords request in writing.

"Mr. Savages request in writing.

"Mr. Lovelands request in writing.

"A Dutchman and his wife request of the towne."

"Dec. 1. Three men, (Morgan, Latham, Avery,) chosen by the town to vew the poynt of land and confirme it to Mr. Loveland, Mr. Tinker, Mr. Lane, and Mr. Stallon, in the best way they can, leaving sufficient way to the Spring for all neighbors."

"Sept. 24, '62.

"Mr. Pisions request for a place for wharfage and building and outland.

"Hugh Moles request for a place by the water side to build vessels on, and a wharfe.

"Consider to do something about the townes landing place."

"Jan. 25, '62-3. Mr. Pisions request per Mr. James Rogers,—the towne doe give him three pole out of yt sixe pole yt is allowed for the towne a landing place, neere Sandie poynt, provided he build and wharfe within one yeere after this grant; the landing place to be but three pole wide."

The above extracts give evidence of an increasing trade, which was bringing the beaches and sandy border of the town into use. Mr. Thomson was the Indian missionary, whose engagements with his simple flock do not appear to have interfered with his attention to civil affairs. Richard Lord was of Hartford; Habijah Savage and Robert Loveland, of Boston; "the Dutchman" was probably Jacob Skillinger, of New Haven. All these persons were more or

less interested in the commerce of the port, and made application for small grants of land for the erection of warehouses. Sandy Point was the swell or circlet of the shore, just at the head of the present Water Street. Here was the town landing place, and the ferry stairs, where passengers from the east side of the river landed. The spring, which was to be kept free for the accommodation of the public, was on the north side of the present Federal Street, east of the head of Bradley Street, gushing out of the side hill, and flowing into the river. It was famous in the early history of the town for its pure, cold, abundant waters, but from the gradual elevation of the ground near the water side, it has of late years entirely disappeared. Capt. John Pyncheon, of Springfield, very early entered into correspondence, in the way of trade, with the plantation, first with Winthrop and afterward with James Rogers, sending cattle and produce hither to be shipped for other markets. "The path to Pequot," traveled by his droves, is mentioned in the early records of Springfield. The site for a warehouse granted him out of the landing-place, reverted afterward to the town. Hugh Mould, a son-in-law of John Coite, was allowed a sufficient quantity of land at Sandy Point, for a carpenter's yard, provided it could be obtained and not "hinder the careening of vessels." Another person who was at this time a resident trader, though not mentioned so early in the minutes, was Samuel Haekburn, or Hagborn, from the Bay colony. He was received as an inhabitant, but meeting with some reverses, left the town in 1665.

In Feb., 1661-2, George Tongue was granted four poles of land before his house-lot on the bank. This was the origin of the names, Tongue's Bank, Tongue's Rocks, and Tongue's Cliff, which continued to be applied to that portion of the water side now covered with the wharves and buildings of Capt. A. Bassett and the Brown brothers, long after the name had otherwise become extinct in the town.

At the same time, grants were made of small portions of the water side, next south of the fort land, to John Culver,¹ William Douglas, and Joshua Raymond. The remainder of the Bank, with the exception of a building yard granted to John Coite, in 1699, was left common until the next century.

"25 Feb., '61-2. Mr. Addis granted to sell beere."

"5 May, '62. Goodman Culver is chosen and allowed of by the towne for the making of bread and bruine of beere for the publicke good."

"The towns desire Mr. Tinker to be by ye court conformed assistant for this yeer, and Oba: Bruen for the taking of oathes and making of warrants and attachments."

"The Book of Lawes is voated to be called for by the constable, Peter Blatchford, and to be delivered to O. Bruen, recorder, for the use of the towne."

This Book of Laws must have been a manuscript copy of the principal enactments of the General Court: every town within the jurisdiction being required to possess one such copy. The colony had no book of printed laws until 1673. The most prominent orders of the General Court, were usually brought home by the deputies, and read or *published*, as it was called, in the next town meeting, and the most important were engrossed in the town book.

" 31 March, 1663.

" James Rogers, James Morgan, John Prentis, and Peter Blatchford, are chosen to draw a petition to the Court respecting the grievances of the town.

" Whereas Cary Latham and Mr. Douglas are by the Court fined for not fully presenting the town list, anno 1662, the town see cause to petition the Court as a grievance, not finding wherein they have failed except in some few houses. Voted, also about the rate of £35. 8s. 9d. as over-rated £1,500, by the Court in March, '62-3."

From the Colonial Records we learn that the court had severely rebuked the listers of the town for the low valuation they had given to estates, observing, "they have not attended any rule of righteousness in their work, but have acted very corruptly therein." The fines were remitted in May, 1663.

" 16 April.

" The town agree with Robert Bartlet for the making of a pair of Stocks with 9 holes fitted to put on the irons for 13s. 4d."

" May 7. John Culver is chosen for this next yeere to drumm Saboth days and as formerly for meetings.

" Francis Hall¹ hath given him two pole of land by the water side, if it be there."

" June 9. Cary Latham, Mr. Douglas and Ralph Parker were to make the Country rate by the list they made of the Town Rate in '62. Our rate according to our list being about 29l. 3s. 9d. Court say 35l. 8s. 9d.

Cary Latham, with myself, O. B. voted to speake with the commity from Court sent to heare the Case, depending, (as the Court expresseth it,) betwixt Uncas and the Inhabitants of New London."

" July 20. Order from the Court to make the rate 31l. 5s., and to be sent by October next."

" 16 Sept.

" Mr. Witherell, Lieut. Smith, James Morgan and Oba. Bruen chosen to

¹ Hall was of Stratford, but had commercial dealings in New London.

hear the grievances of the inhabitants of wrong done by the Indians, and draw a petition in the town's behalf."

" 26 Oct. This being the town meeting, James Bemas should have acknowledged his offence against the Major—he came not to it.

" Mr. Skillinger propounded the sale of his land and house this day,—none offered any thing."

Skillinger in 1668 and '69 was of Southampton, L. I., and one of a company associated for the purpose of whaling in boats along the coast.¹

" Dec. 14.

" Mr. Winthrop hath all his land at Naibantick given him rate free for tyme to come. Also he hath given him a pond of water betwixt his land at naihantick and the land now in possession of John Printice. John Printice objects against this towne grant of ye pond.

" George Chapple hath given him 6 acres of land for a house-lot betwixt the neck fence and Jordan river, part of it buting on Jordan river."

This is the earliest notice found of the name Jordan, applied to the stream that has ever since borne the designation. Chappell had sold his house-lot in town to the Indian missionary, William Thomson, and soon removed to this new grant "by Naihantick way-side." The September following, Clement Minor applied for a house-lot next to George Chappell, where it is said "he hath now built." These were the first settlers in the Jordan district.

" 15 Jan : '63-4. James Rogers, Lev. Smith, Cary Latham, John Smith, and William Hough, are appoynted to goe to Mr. Buckley for the settling him amongst us."

" 25 Feb. Old Mrs. Buckleys request to be read.

" Mr. Buckley for enlarging maintenance yt he may keep a man and also take the geting of wood into his owne handes—if not let 10*l.* more be aded to our town rate for wood cutting and carting, and 4*l.* for raising the pulpet.

" Inhabitants not to entertaine strange young men. Vide country order, read.

" The order of cardes and order of shufflebords :—I read.

" It is agreed by the towne that henceforward Mr. Buckley shall have sixe score pound a yeere, in provision pay, good and marchandable, he freeing the towne from all other ingagments."

" April 18.

" A Country rate sent to us from Hartford,—this day was the first day I herd of it; 29*l.* 18*s.* 9*d.*

" 3 or 4 Listers to be chosen, one of them a Commissioner; Mr. Wetherell, Commissioner."

" Sept. 21.

" To determine a more certain way for the ministry to be upheld amongst us.

1 Thompson's Long Island, p. 191.

"The Towne have agreed that there shall be a petition drawn in the behalf of the Towne, Mr. James Rogers, Ensigne Avery and Mr. Wetherell are chosen to set it be done with reference to Pockatuck pay of rates to our towne as formerly they did."

"Nov. 21.

"At this towne meeting it was voated that there should be an Atturayne for the towne to see to the coming in of the ministers rate and other towne rates. Peter Blatchford chosen Attorney."

"Jan: 9, 1664-5.

"Peter Blatchford to be paid for a voyage to the River's Mouth, about the guns, 12s."

The General Court, in May, 1660, had ordered that two great guns, with shot convenient, then at Saybrook, should be lent to New London. The above charge was doubtless connected with the removal of these pieces. Under the same date is noticed a debt of 15s. to Richard Hartley, for providing a "seat for the guard in the meeting-house," an item showing that men still went armed to the house of worship, and that the fear of sudden attacks from Indians had not subsided.

"Goodman Burrose chosen ferryman for Mistick river, to ferry a horse and a man for a groat.

"Goodman Culver is allowed by the towne to sell liquors, provided he shall brew also, ells not: provided also the court allow of it, ingaging always to have good beere and good dyet and lodging for man and horse, to attende alsoe to good order."

"At a town meeting Feb. 25, 1664 [1665.]

"The towne being desired to declare there myndes concerning Mr. Bulkley, it was propounded whether they were willing to leave Mr. Bulkley to the libertye of his conscience without compelling him or enforcing him to anything in the execution of his place and office contrarye to his light according to the laws of the commonwelth.

"Voated to be there myndes."

This is the first intimation on record of any uneasiness existing between Mr. Bulkley and the people. There are no church records that reach back to this period, and his reasons for leaving are but obscurely intimated. He had not been settled and no great formality was necessary to his departure.

"At a towne meeting, June 10.

"The Towne understanding Mr. Buckleys intention to goe into the Bay have sent James Morgan and Mr. Douglas to desire him to stay untill seacond day com seventnight which day the Towne have agreed to ask againe Mr. Fitch to speake with him in order to know Mr. Buckleys mynde fullye whether he will continue with us or no to preach the gospel."

That this overture was unsuccessful is evident from a subsequent entry :

" July 10—'65. In towne meeting.

" If it be your myndes yt Mr. James Rogers shall goe in the behalfe of the towne to Mr. Brewster to give him a call and to know whether he will come to us to be our minister, and yt he shall intercead to Mr. Pell first to be helpful to us herein, manifest it by lifting up your hands. Voted."

The person to whom this application was made is supposed to have been Rev. Nathaniel Brewster, of Brookhaven, L. I. No further allusion is made to him.

" 24 July. John Packer desires that Leistenant Avery and James Morgan may issue the busines yt is now in contest betwixt him and the Indians at Nai-wayuncke and to compound with them in the best way they can with land to satisfaction of the Indians and Goodman Packer. Voted."

" 9 October. Mr. Douglas by a full voate none manifesting themselves to the contrary, was chosen to goe to Mr. Wilson and Mr. Elliot to desire there advise and help for the procureings of a minister for the towne."

" Nov. 24. A town meeting concerning what Mr. Douglas hath done about a minister."

" Nov. 24, 1665. It is agreed at this town meeting that a letter be writ and sent from the town to Deacon Parke of Roxburye to treat with Mr. Broadstreet in the behalfe of the towne to come to us for this end to supply the towne in the worke of the ministry, in which letter sent full powre be given to Mr. Parke to act in our behalfe, the towne expressing themselves willing to give 60lb and rather than that the work seas, to proceed to ten pound more, giving our trusty friend liberty to treat with others in case our desire of Mr. Broadstreet faile."

" A Court order for a brand-mark and horses to be branded, this day read.

" Mr. Douglas confermed in his place for the Townes packer of meat. And also he was voted and chosen to brand mark all horses with L on the left shouler and is to record all horses soe branded."

" Jun: 12, 1665 [66.]

" The return of Mr. Brodstreet's letter to be read.

" Thomas Robinson to propound [for an inhabitant.]

" A rate to underpin the meeting-house.

" Concerning messengers to goe for Mr. Bradstreet.

" Also for a place where he shall be when he comes. Also for provision for the messengers,—some course to be taken for 5lb for them.

" The Town rate for Nihantick part £26 6s. 6d.

" The East side ye River £35 6s. 10d."

" Feb. 26. It is voated that Left: Avery and James Morgan be chosen messengers to fetch up Mr. Bradstreet as soon as moderate weather presents."

" John Smith and goodman Nicholls shall receive Contribution every Lords daye and preserve it for ye publick good.

" It is voated and agreed that the townsmen shall have power to provide what is needful for the Messengers that are sent to Mr. Bradstreet and also to provide for him a place to reside in at his coming.

"Mr. Douglas and goodman Hough are voted by ye Towne to demand the 80 pound of Mr. Buckley which he stands ingaged to pay to ye towne.

"Voted by ye Towne that Leift. Avery and James Morgan have power to agree with any person that hath a serviceable horse to be emploied in fetching up Mr. Bradstreet and what agreement they make the towne to allowe and make good the same."

[In the Town accounts of the next year appears due
"To Goodman Prentice for his horse, 10s.
To Goodman Royce for ye ministers dyet, 15lb."]

"Voted that a Towne rate of 40lb. be made imediately for ye payment of Towne depts and providing to acomadate a minister and repareing the meeting house."

At the same date with the foregoing arrangements in regard to Mr. Bradstreet, a vote was passed, which shows that no embittered feeling had grown up between Mr. Bulkley and the people. Though he had ceased to be considered as their minister, he remained in the town, and occupied the pulpit with acceptance until a successor was obtained.

"It is voated and agreed that Mr. Buckley for his time and paines taken in preaching the word of God to us since the time of his yeere was expired shall have thirty pounds to be gathered by a rate."

Mr. Bulkley is supposed to have removed from New London to Wethersfield in the early part of the year 1667. The thirty pounds voted him by the town, was relinquished, in part payment of the eighty pounds for which he stood indebted. The town was inveterate and persevering in its attempts to recover the remaining fifty pounds, and kept up the dunning process until Mr. Bulkley, in 1668, mortgaged his house and lot to Samuel Shrimpton of Boston, and obtained means to liquidate the debt. Mr. Bulkley was minister of the church in Wethersfield, for a number of years, but finally gave up preaching for the practice of medicine, on account it is said of the weakness of his voice. He was a man of learning and added to his theological attainments no inconsiderable knowledge of medicine and surgery.

The house lot lying south of the meeting house, originally Mr. Bruen's, was now purchased for the ministry, of Mr. Douglas, and Mrs. Grace Bulkley.

"June 1, 1666.

"Voted by a Vnanimous consent that Mr. Bradstreet is accepted in ye worke of ye ministry amongst vs, and that he have 80 lb. pr yeare to encourage him in the worke, to be gathered by way of rate.

"Voted by the Towne that there shall be a house imediately built for ye min-

istry, the dimensions to be 36 foote in length and 25 in breadth and 13 studd betwixt ye joyns with a stack of stone chimneys in the midst. The house to be a girt house.

"The towne are free to give for ye building of the house one hundred pound and also to farther paye ye masons for building a stone chimney and glaze ye house windowes.

"Voted by the towne that the house now agreed upon to be buildt for the ministry, and also the house and land bought of Mr. Douglass together with ye land which hitherto hath been reserved for the ministry shall so remaine both houses and lands for the ministry, both to us and our succeeding generatiounes never to be sold or alienated to any other vse forever."

For the immediate accommodation of Mr. Bradstreet, the house vacated by Mr. Bulkley was hired for one year from April 1, 1667; house, orchard and six acre lot for ten pounds provision pay. In the mean time spirited exertions were made to build "the Towne's house," or parsonage, and to have it completed during the year. It was the business of the whole town to erect this house, and the inhabitants at large were called together to give directions concerning the different parts. Distinct votes were taken about the stone work, iron work and wood work—"the bigness of the seller," the carting, the digging, the lime and the nails. "Griswell and Parkes" must do the iron-work—Nathaniel Royce dig the cellar the size of one room and seven feet deep. When it was completed, a committee was chosen to view the work and determine if it was well done—the masons in particular were not to be paid until it was ascertained that the chimneys were sufficient. The cost appears to have come very nearly within the one hundred pounds granted for the purpose.

Mr. Bradstreet's salary was increased to ninety pounds per annum, and a committee appointed in December, 1667, to endeavor to effect an immediate settlement, but from causes not explained a delay of three years occurred before this was accomplished.

The hand writing of Obadiah Bruen in the minutes, ceases with the year 1665. William Douglas and Daniel Wetherell were afterward moderators alternately, and continued the minutes to 1670. Mr. Bruen held the office of Recorder another year, and then removed to Newark, New Jersey. Mr. Douglas was Recorder for the year 1667. Mr. Wetherell for 1668 and 1669.

*First Town Clerks.**Johnna: Brewster**Thadie Bradstreet**William Douglas**Bartholomew Post*

"25 Feb. 66-7.

"Robert Rice [Royce] voated and chosen by the towne to keep ye Ordinary."

Mr. Royce lived on Post-hill. The town had granted him the house lot of Richard Post, to which he added by purchase the Blin-man and Mudge house lots.

"15 Aug. 67. Myselfe [Douglas] chosen to hold the box for the contributions and this to be propounded to Mr. Bradstreet to have his advise therein. William Nickols is also chosen for that worke.

"It is voated that the men chosen to call the collectors to account shall have a letter of attorney to impower them to do their work, and that Mr. Meryt shall write it."

This is the earliest notice of Thomas Meritt, or Maritt, who was often afterwards employed as writer or scrivener for the town.

"30, October. John Prentis chosen Townes attorney.

"9, December. It is voted that the prison house shall stand by ye meeting house."

This vote intimates that the inhabitants were about to erect a town jail; it was probably placed according to the vote on the open square, near the meeting house. This was the jail so much used for Indians in the time of Philip's war, and was the first erected in the town. Petty criminals had hitherto been kept under ward in a private house; state criminals transported to Hartford, and there was no imprisonment for debt. The code of laws enacted in the colony in 1650, exempted debtors from imprisonment, except in cases of fraud or concealment of property. The words are:

"No man's person shall be kept in prison for debt but when there appears some estate which he will not produce." [See Code of 1650 in Col. Rec., vol. 1.

"1. July 1669.

"Alexander Piggin hath given him some land at the head of Mill Cove enough to make three or four pits for dressing of leather amongst the springs."

Mr. Pygan was from Norwich, England, and an inhabitant of some three years standing. He was not the first person to practise "the art and mystery of tanning," in the place; Hugh Roberts was a tanner, and had his pits or vats in a meadow near the entrance of Cape Ann Lane. His establishment was purchased about 1670, by Joseph Truman.

"It is voted and agreed that Clement Miner have sold him sixe acors upland over against his house upon the north side the highway that goes to Niantick, and 8 acors of swampy land near Goodman Houghs which land is for consideration of 8 wolves by him killed. And the towne doth order the Townesman to give him a deed of sale for the same."

The swamps around New London were infested to an unusual degree with these perilous animals. Though an act of the General Court had ordered every town to pay a bounty of fifteen shillings for the killing of a wolf within its bounds, New London had always paid twenty shillings. On every side of the plantation these animals abounded. The bounty had been demanded by Edmund Fanning, James Morgan, James Avery,—these were killed east of the river; by Daniel Comstock, towards Mohegan; William Peake, in Cedar Swamp, and Hugh Caulkins, were paid four pounds for killing four wolves in the year 1660, at Nahantick. After 1667, the bounty was sixteen shillings, paid half by the towns, and half by the country treasury. In 1673, this bounty was claimed by Nehemiah Smith, and Samuel and Nathaniel Royce for killing each five wolves; Matthew Beckwith two, and Aaron Starke two; making nineteen howling tenants of the forest destroyed within the limits of the town that year. The havoc made by wild beasts was a great drawback on the wool-growing interest which was then of more importance to the farmers than at the present day.

"Sept. 9. 1669. In answer to Mr. Broadstreet's proposition for easeing him in the chardge of his wood the Towne doe freely consent to help him therein, and some with carts and some for cutting and that next traineing daye a tyme be apoynted for accomplishment thereof and that Leif' Avery be deputed to nominate ye daye."

"Nov. 29.

"Left Avery, Mr. Rogers, James Morgan Sen. and John Morgan chosen to lay out the King's highway between Norwich and Mystick.

"Wm. Hough, John Stebbins, Clement Miner and Isaac Willey to lay out the King's highway between New London and the head of Niantick river.

"John Keeny is appointed to sell powder, shot and lead to any Indian or Indians, he having purchased his liberty therein at 33s. to be paid to the town."

"Feb. 28. 1669 [70.]

"Charles Hill chosen Recorder.

"Manasse Minor is admitted an Inhabitant in this Towne."

Manasseh Minor is supposed to have been the first born male of New London, and the first son of the town admitted to the privileges of an inhabitant.¹ Others of the second generation, Clement Minor, brother of Manasseh, Daniel Comstock, Isaac Willey, Jr., Robert Douglas, Gabriel Harris, Joseph Coite, Samuel Rogers, Jonathan Royce, had arrived at maturity, and been received as men among the fathers; but they looked to other places, and some of them across the waters for their nativity. Manasseh Minor was the child of the soil. This simple fact, more than any array of words, sets before us the lapse of time, and the age and progress of the town.

"16 Jan., 1670-1. Mr. Edward Palmes hath liberty granted to make a seat for himself and relations at ye north end of ye pulpit.

"Voted that there be 2 Galleryes made on each side ye meeting house,—[the width of two seats.]

Here terminate those original memoranda which have hitherto been so faithfully followed. We shall no longer have the guidance of the moderator's little note-books. The records for the next forty years were very loosely kept, the entries being made in a hasty manner, and with little regard to the order of occurrence.

Mr. Bradstreet's ordination was delayed four years after he became the minister of the town. His salary was at first £90 per annum, in current country pay, with fire wood furnished, and the parsonage kept in repair. This was soon increased to £100, which was equal to the salary of some of the most noted ministers in New England at that period. In 1681, after his health began to fail, it was further enlarged to £120.

The church record kept by Mr. Bradstreet, commences Oct. 5,

¹ Mr. Minor continued in New London ten or twelve years; he then returned to Stonington where he died March 22d, 1728-9. Most of his children were born in New London.

1670, which, according to Trumbull, the historian of Connecticut, was the day of his ordination, but that fact is not noticed in the record. It begins with the following list:

“The Members of the Church.

Lieutenant James Avery, and wife.

Thomas Miner, and wife.

James Morgan, senior, and wife.

William Meades, and wife.

Mr. William Douglas, and wife.

John Smith, and wife.

Mr. Ralph Parker, and wife.

William Hough, and wife.

William Nichols, Robert Royce,

John Prentice, Mrs. Rogers,

Goodwife Gallop, of Mystic, Goodwife Keeny,

Goodwife Coyte, Goodwife Lewis.

“Mr. James Rogers not long after owned a member here, being a member in full communion in Milsford church.”

This ordination was the first in town: no previous minister had been regularly settled. Whether the church was formed at this, or some former period, is left doubtful, as neither the church nor the town records allude to any organization. It would seem strange, if during the twenty years that had elapsed since the gathering of the congregation under Mr. Blinman’s oversight, there had been no embodiment into church estate,—no covenant or bond of union agreed upon by the church members. Trumbull, however, supposes that the church was not formed until Mr. Bradstreet’s ordination. According to the laws of the colony, no persons could embody into church estate “without the consent of the General Court, and approbation of the neighboring elders.” There is no account on record of application made by the town for this privilege, either at this or any preceding period.

Before closing the chapter, the new names that appear between 1661 and 1671, must be collected. Several of those contained in the following list have been already mentioned incidentally.

In 1661, Robert *Lattemore* (Latimer) is first mentioned. He was a mariner. William *Cotter* had a house-lot grant of six acres; his wife was Elinor, but no other family has been traced. In October, “Goodman *Hansell*, the smith,” was received as an inhabitant. This was the person elsewhere called George *Halsall*, the blacksmith. In Jan. 1661–2, John *Borden* was admitted to the privileges of an inhabitant. He had recently married the daughter of William Hough,

and was probably a son of the John Borden of 1650. After a few years he removed to Lyme. At the same time permission was given to "John *Ells*, the glover," to live in the town. *Ells* is probably a mistake for *Ellis*.

In 1662, we first meet with the names of Abraham *Dea*, William *Peake* or *Pike*, Edmund *Fanning*, (east side of the river,) Josiah *Read*, Thomas *Stafford*, John *Terrall*.

In 1663, John *Daniel*, Samuel *Chester*, and William *Condy* appear. The two last were from Boston, and engaged in the West India trade, as commanders, owners and factors. They had a warehouse and landing place on Close Cove. *Condy*, after a few years, returned to Boston. Early in 1664, court orders were published prohibiting the use of "cardes and shufflebords," and warning the inhabitants "not to entertaine strange young men." Transient residents, who were not grantees and householders, were the persons affected by this order, and it aroused them to the necessity of applying for permission to remain. The roll of applicants consisted of Abraham *Daynes*, William *Chapell*, William *Collins*, George *Codner*, William *Cooley*, John *Elce*, (*Ellis*,) Charles *Haynes*, Thomas *Marshall*, William *Measure*, John *Sullaven*, William *Terrall*, Samuel *Tubbs*. Most of these were allowed to remain, and a general permit was added:

"All other sojourners not mentioned, carrying themselves well, are allowed to live in the towne, else lyable upon warning to begone."

The same year we find notices of Richard *Dart*, who bought (Sept. 12th, 1664) the house and lot of William *Welman*,¹ Benjamin *Grant*, afterward of Lyme, Oliver *Manwaring*, son-in-law of Joshua Raymond, Thomas *Martin*, Samuel *Starr*, son-in-law of Jonathan Brewster, William *Williams*, a grantee on the east side of the river, and Captain John and Wait *Winthrop*, the sons of the governor.

In 1665, Charles *Hill* and Christopher *Christophers* appear on the roll of inhabitants. They were traders in partnership, and made their first purchases on Mill Cove, of warehouses and wharfage, where Richard Hartley and John Tinker had previously traded. The firm of *Hill* and *Christophers* was probably the first regular co-partnership in the town. Mr. *Christophers* was a mariner, and engaged in trade with Barbadoes: he had an older brother, Jeffrey *Christophers*, also a mariner, who probably settled in the place at the

¹ *Welman* removed to Killingworth, where he died in 1670.

same time, though his name does not occur so early. They both brought families with them.

In 1666, persons who are mentioned as inhabitants, but without any reference to date of arrival or settlement, are Benjamin *Atwell*, Thomas *Forster*, commanding a vessel in the Barbadoes trade, George *Sharswood*, Thomas *Robinson*, Peter *Spicer*, (living east of the river,) and Gabriel *Woodmancy*.

In 1667, appear John *Baldwin*, Peter *Treby*, Joseph *Truman*, and John *Wheeler*. About 1668, Philip *Bill* came from Ipswich, and settled east of the river, near Robert *Allyn* and George *Geer*. Thomas *Bolles*, supposed to have come from Wells, in Maine, settled in the town plot. In 1670, or near that time, we first meet with Thomas *Dymond* and Benjamin *Shapley*, both mariners, the former from Fairfield, and the latter from Charlestown, in the neighborhood of Boston.

To these we may add John *Gard*, George *Garmand*, Joseph *Elliot*, Henry *Philips*, and Nicholas *Towson*, names that are on the rate list of 1667, but are not mentioned elsewhere upon the records.

C H A P T E R X I.

Bankruptcy of William Addis.—Some account of Thomas Reavell.—Broils and lawsuits.—Tinker *versus* Morton, Haughton and Thomson.—The constable's protest.—Thomson's deposition.—Lieut. Smith absconds and settles in Virginia.—Names and estates from rate lists.—Epitaph on Richard Lord.—Brief notices of removed persons, Lake, Bruen, Blatchford, Lane, Allyn, Caulkins, Gager, Lothrop.

THE history of this decade of years (from 1660 to 1670) will not be complete without taking up some points to which no reference is made in the moderator's minutes, hitherto followed.

Governor Winthrop issued an order, April 25th, 1661, for a court of investigation to sit at New London, and examine the affairs of William Addis, on complaint of Mr. Thomas Reavell, the principal creditor of Mr. Addis. The court sat in May, and consisted of Deputy Governor Mason and the assistant and commissioners of New London, viz., Mr. Tinker, Mr. Bruen, and Mr. Rogers. It appeared that Mr. Addis had been intrusted by Mr. Reavell and his friends in London, with a cargo of merchandise and several sums of money amounting to £760 sterling, to trade with and improve for the said Reavell and his friends, in New England. He had made no returns: he acknowledged the trust, but said the capital had nearly all disappeared; he could not tell how, except that he had lost £300 by fire, and somewhat by a defect in meat, which he had sent to Barbadoes, consigned to Mr. Reavell. No dishonesty was proved against him; he freely resigned all that he had remaining; expressed great sorrow for the result and threw himself on the charity of Mr. Reavell, to be allowed to remain in his house and pursue his calling for a subsistence and livelihood in his old age.

William Addis had been an early resident at Gloucester, Mass., where he was one of the townsmen in 1642, but he is not mentioned on the records of that place after 1649, and there is no evidence that

he was ever a land owner there.¹ The years that intervened between his disappearance from Gloucester, and his first grant in New London, (Dec. 19th, 1658,) may have been spent in England, where he obtained the credit and embarked in the enterprise which in the end proved ruinous to him.²

We are unable to say who Mr. Reavell was. In 1658, he was said to be "merchant of London;" in 1660, of *Barbadoes*; and a letter of attorney to Nathaniel Sylvester, of Shelter Island, in 1662,³ styles him vaguely "Thomas Revell, of New England." The governor's commission mentions no residence. By means of the house and land conveyed to him, he was for a number of years, a proprietor in New London, and his name appears on the rate lists.

There can be little doubt but that he was one of the supporters of the Commonwealth, who was proscribed at the restoration, and obliged to remain in some degree of concealment and obscurity. Perhaps he may be identified as the same Thomas Revel that lived for many years the life of a hermit in the woods of Quincy.⁴ His decease must have been anterior to 1667, as Charles Hill that year brought an action of debt against his estate for freight of horses, at some former period, to Barbadoes. Recovered £155 and costs.

In 1672, Alexander Bryan, of Milford, brought a similar action against the estate, and recovered £95. To satisfy, in part, these creditors, Mr. Reavell's house and land were taken. It was the same tenement that Mr. Blinman conveyed to William Addis, on his departure for England, and stood at the west end of the old bridge over Bream Cove.

The years 1661 and 1662 were noted for strife and turbulence among the inhabitants. Cases of calumny and riot were common.

1 J. G. Babson, Esq., of Gloucester, (MS.)

2 His daughter, Millicent, the only child of whom we have obtained information, married, first, William Southmead, and by him had two sons, William and John Southmead. Her second husband was William Ash, of Gloucester, and her third, Thomas Beebe, of New London.

3 This letter was for the recovery of certain goods belonging to Mr. Reavell, in the hands of Richard Hartley, deceased.

4 "When he died the Governor of the Province and other distinguished men came out of Boston and were his pall-bearers. From which circumstance his true character was brought to light." See note in Whitney's Hist. of Quincy. He is there called "a regicide of the reign of Charles I." This must be a mistake, as no one of that name was member of the parliament that pronounced sentence on Charles I.

The disorderly elements of society were in motion, and the influence of the wise and good was scarcely sufficient to keep them in subjection. No clear account of any one case can be given, as they appear before us only in the form of depositions, protests, suits at law, fines and complaints. Several of the inhabitants accused Mr. Tinker, the assistant and first magistrate in town, of speaking treasonable words, and of using dishonorable means to obtain testimony against his adversaries; and Mr. Tinker brought suits for defamation against Messrs. Haughton, Morton and Thomson, the Indian missionary. The trials were in the Particular Court, and the issue may be gathered from a passage in the records of the General Court.

"This Court upon consideration of Mr. Tinker's encouragement in his place and employment, do order £12 to be paid to him by the treasurer out of the fines imposed on Morton, Haughton, and Mr. Thomson."¹

Mr. Tinker was popular both with the town authorities and the General Court, and had been chosen townsman, list and rate-maker, deputy and assistant. He had established a distillery in the town, and was not only licensed by the court to distill and retail liquors, but empowered to suppress all others who sold by retail in the township. It was with little chance of success that accusations against a character so highly respected were carried before the magistrates at Hartford. That venerable body doubtless regarded with apprehensive forebodings the new and boisterous community that was growing up under their shadow. We can at least imagine them to have had some misgivings when William Morton, the constable, led off with the following pompous protest :

"To all whome it may concerne.

"You may please to take notice that I William Morton of New London being chosen by the Towne of New London to be a Constable and by oath being bound to execute that place faithfully as also being a free Denison of that most famos country of England and have taken an oath of that Land to be true to his Royall Maiestie o' now Gracious King Charles the Seacond of Glorious renowne, I count that I cannot be faithfull unto my oath nor to his maiestie, neither should I be faithfull to the Country wch lyes under reproaches for such maner of speeches and carriages already wherefore having evidences that M^r John Tinker, who is lookt at as one that should exsicute Justice and sworne by oath soe to doe, espetially to studdie the hono' of o' Royall King and of his Life and happie being, yet notwithstanding the saide Tinker although it was notoriously knowne unto him that some had spoaken Treason against the king

in a high degree to the greate dishonor of his Royall maestic and farther some
pressed him againe and againe to doe Justice for the king yet although they
declared what and what was to be testified by one there preasent, he flung
away the testimony, wherfore in the name of his majesty whose deputy I am
I doe protest against the said Tinker, that he has concealed treason against the
king contrary to the Lawes of England, so as I conceive has brought himselfe
under treason, And as I doe protest against him I desire all that reade this or
heare of it to be my witnesses—published by me. 20. March: 1662.

“ WILLIAM MORTON,

“ In New London in New England.

“ Constable.”

A writ of attachment was issued by the Court, at their May session, against William Morton and Richard Haughton, bringing them under a bond of £500 to appear and answer to the suit of Mr. John Tinker, before his majesty's court of justice in Hartford, the next September. In October of the same year, before any accommodation or decision had taken place, Mr. Tinker died suddenly in Hartford, and was honored with a funeral at the public expense. Though the principal party was thus removed from all participation in the suit, it was prolonged for several years. It was finally referred to a committee of the Legislature in May, 1666.¹ A curious reference to what took place in the trial of the case in Sept., 1662, is found in a deposition of Mr. Thomson, recorded in New London.

“ I William Thomson, Clarke, being present when Mr. Morton had a tryall in Hartford in New England in the year of our Lord God 1662 about treason spoken against his sacred Majestie when Mr. Mathew Allin being the moderator in the Governor's absence did deny to try the said cause by the laws of Old England when it was required by the said Morton that he would doe justice for the king, he answered tauntingly to the said Morton—he should have justice, if it were to hang half a dusen of you.—Further saith not.

W: Thompson

“ Jurator coram me, George Jordan, April 26, 1664.

“ Test Georgius Wilkins, Clericus County Surry, Virginia.”

Lieutenant Samuel Smith, from his first settlement in the town was much trusted in public affairs, nor is it manifest that in any instance he performed the duties of office otherwise than with discre-

¹ Conn. Colonial Records, vol. 2, p. 27.

tion and honor. The last time that his name appears on the town record as an inhabitant, was Jan. 15th, 1663-4, when he was appointed one of a committee to treat with Mr. Bulkley concerning his ordination. On the 28th of March, 1664, his wife Rebecca Smith, in his behalf, conveys his farm, at Upper Alewife Cove, to Robert Loveland in payment of debts due to him. From other sources we learn that the lieutenant had left wife, home and friends, and gone to Virginia without any intention of returning. No reason is assigned for the act: though somewhat involved in debt, he had sufficient estate to satisfy his creditors. Copies of the letters written to him by the Rev. Mr. Bulkley, with other papers relating to this singular affair, have been preserved.¹ Mr. Bulkley exhorted him in moving terms to return to the path of duty, setting before him his former station and influence in society, and his religious profession, depicting also the grief of his wife and aged mother. The lieutenant's own letters are dated at Roanoke:² he addresses his wife in terms plausible and affectionate;³ sends love to father, mother, brothers and sisters, and is solicitous to be remembered in the prayers of his friends. All this had no meaning: it was soon apparent that the lieutenant had absconded and that his wife was deserted. In August, 1665, some gentlemen of Hartford wrote to him, making one more attempt to reclaim the wanderer, but it is not known that he took any notice of it.

Lieut. Smith is supposed to have been the son of that Lieut. Samuel Smith, Sen., of Wethersfield, who removed about the year 1660, to Hadley.⁴ His wife was a daughter of Rev. Henry Smith, of Wethersfield. After her desertion, she returned to her former home, and having obtained a divorce from her delinquent husband, was in 1669 the wife of Nathaniel Bowman of Wethersfield. Lieut. Smith had no children by this wife, but it is supposed that he married at the south and left descendants there.

Rate lists for the ministry tax are extant for the years 1664, 1666 and 1667. After this period no rate list can be found till 1708. In the

¹ Among the State Records at Hartford; in a volume of arranged documents, labeled *Divorces*.

² His residence is sometimes said to be in Virginia, and again in Carolina. He says in one of his letters, "I live at the house of one Samuel Stevens, in the province of Carolina."

³ Calls her "sweetheart," and subscribes himself "your loving husband till death."

⁴ Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

list of 1664, the number of names is one hundred and five. This includes non-residents who owned property in the town. In this list, the amount of each man's taxable property is given and the rate levied upon it is carried out. The assessment of James Rogers is nearly double that of any other inhabitant. He is estimated at £548, and his rate £7 19s. 10d. "John Winthrop Squire," who heads the list, is set down at £185, and his rate £2 14s. He was at this time a non-resident. Mr. Palmes, £224. John Picket, who is next highest to James Rogers, £299 10s. James Morgan, £252. Robert Burrows, £246. James Avery, £236. Cary Latham, £217. George Tongue, £182. John Prentis, £176. Andrew Lester, Sen., £170. Edward Stallion, £169. Robert Royce, £163. These are all the estates over £150. Between £75 and £150 are thirty-two. It must be remembered that *land* at this period was of little value, and estimated low. In the list of 1666, the number of names is 116, and in that of the next year 127. Of the whole number, four are referred to as deceased, viz., Sergt. Richard Hartley, Thomas Hungersford, William Morton, and Mr. Robert Parke. About seventeen may be marked as non-residents, consisting principally of persons who had removed, or merchants of other places who had an interest in the trade of the port. Mr. Blinman, the ex-minister, Mr. Thomson, the former Indian missionary, and Mr. Newman, minister of Wenham, are on the list. Mr. James Richards, of Hartford, is among the number: he was probably a land-owner by inheritance from Wm. Gibbons, who was his father-in-law, and had bought land at Pequonnuck. Mr. Fitch, (probably Samuel, of Hartford,) Samuel Hackburne, from Roxbury, and Robert Lay, (of Lyme) are enrolled; as also Lord, Savage, Stillinger, Revell, Richardson, who have been heretofore noticed.

Richard Lord. Both father and son of this name, merchants of Hartford, had commercial dealings in New London. The senior Mr. Lord, died in the place and was interred in the old burial ground. A table of red sandstone covers his grave. It is now sunk a little below the surface of the turf, and has a gaping fracture through it, but the inscription is legible. It is probably the oldest inscribed tombstone east of Connecticut River. A copy will be given as near to a fac-simile as can be executed in type.

AN EPITAPH ON CAPTAINE RICHARD LORD DECEASED.

MAY 17 1662 ÆTATIS SVÆ 51

THE BRIGHT STARRE OF OVR CAVALLRIE LYES HERE
VNTO THE STATE A COVNSELOVR FVLL DEARE
AND TO ^e TRVTH A FRIEND OF SWEETE CONTEⁿNT.
TO HARTFORD TOWNE A SILVER ORNAMENT.
WHO CAN DENY TO POORE he WAS RELEIFE
AND IN COMPOSING PAROXYSMES WAS CHEIFE.
TO MARCHANTES AS A PATTERNE HE MIGHT STAND
ADVENTRING DANGERS NEW BY SEA AND LAND.

Richard Lord was captain of a troop of horsemen established in Connecticut in 1658—the first cavalry of the colony. This explains “the bright star of our cavalry,” in the first line. The expression “composing paroxysms,” is obscure, but it may allude to a happy faculty of reconciling parties at variance. Mr. Lord’s name is found on several arbitrations for accommodating difficulties.

The removals* before 1670 of persons who had lived from five to eighteen years in the plantation amounted to a dozen or more. Mr. Winthrop, as already mentioned, went to Hartford; Mrs. Lake to Ipswich; Obadiah Bruen and Hugh Roberts to Newark; Peter Blatchford to Haddam; Daniel Lane to Setauket, Long Island; and the settlement of Norwich took away Robert Allyn, Hugh Caulkins, with his son John, and son-in-law Jonathan Royce, John Elderkin, Samuel Lothrop, and John Gager.

Who was Mrs. Margaret Lake? No satisfactory answer can be given to this question. Her birth, parentage, husband, and the period of her coming to this country are alike unknown. The suggestion has been made in a former chapter, that she was sister to Mr. Winthrop’s wife. That she was in some way intimately connected with the Winthrop family of New London, is placed beyond doubt by documents in which she is represented as *sister* to the parents, and near of kin to the children. Fitz John and Wait Winthrop in a deed of 1681 to Mrs. Hannah Gallop, the daughter of Mrs. Lake, say of her—“the said Hannah being a person related to and beloved of both our honored father and ourselves.”

Mrs. Lake, as well as the Winthrops, was also connected with the two families of Epes and Symonds, of Ipswich, but the degree of relationship between these several families has not been positively ascertained.

The farm at Lake’s Pond and other lands of Mrs. Lake in New London were inherited by her daughter Gallop. The signature to several documents of hers, recorded in New London, consists of her initials only, in printed form, M L., which are attested as her mark. She died in Ipswich in 1672,¹ leaving two children—Hannah, wife of John Gallop, of New London, and Martha, wife of Thomas Harris, of Ipswich.

¹ Felt’s History of Ipswich, p. 160.

Obadiah Bruen. During the sixteen years in which Mr. Bruen dwelt in the young plantation, he was perhaps more intimately identified with its public concerns than any other man. He was chosen a townsman for fifteen years in succession, and except the first year, uniformly first townsman and moderator. He was usually on all committees for granting lands, building meeting-houses and accommodating differences. He was clerk or recorder of the town all the time he was an inhabitant; and in 1661, on the first organization of the County Court, he was chosen clerk of that body. In the charter of Connecticut granted by Charles II., his name appears as one of the patentees of the colony, and the only one from the town, which is proof that he was then considered its most prominent inhabitant. He appears to have been a persevering, plodding, able and discreet man, who accomplished a large amount of business, was helpful to every body, and left every thing which he undertook, the better for his management.

Mr. Bruen was entered a freeman of Plymouth colony, March 2d, 1640-41, being then a resident at Green Harbor, (Marshfield.) In May, 1642, he was of Gloucester, and the first town-clerk of that place who has left any records. Before 1650, he was chosen seven times deputy to the General Court.¹ The births of two children are entered at Gloucester in his own hand:

“Hannah, daughter of Obadiah Bruen by Sarae, his wife, was born 9th day of January, 1643.

“John, son of do. 2. June 1646.”

Only two other children, Mary and Rebecca, both probably older than these, have been traced.

Mr. Bruen's emigration from Cape Ann to Pequot Harbor, and his usefulness here, have been noticed in the preceding pages. He bade farewell to New London in 1667, having joined a company of planters from several towns on the Sound, who had formed an association to purchase and settle a township on the Passaic River in New Jersey. The settlement had been commenced by a portion of the company the year before. The deed of purchase from the Indians is dated July 11th, 1667, and signed by Obadiah Bruen, Michael Tompkins, Samuel Ketchell, John Browne, and Robert Denison, in behalf of their associates, amounting to about forty persons.² An additional party of twenty-three joined them the same year, and all uni-

¹ Babson, of Gloucester, (MS.)

² Whitehead's East Jersey under the Proprietors.

ted in forming one township, which received the name of Newark, in compliment, it is said, to their pastor, the Rev. Abraham Pierson, who had preached at Newark in Nottinghamshire, England.

Of the sixty-three persons whose names are given as the first settlers of Newark, two certainly were from New London, Obadiah Bruen and Hugh Roberts, the son-in-law of Hugh Caulkins. Mr. Roberts was living at Newark in 1670, but our records furnish no later reference to him.¹ Two others on the list of settlers, though not from New London, were intimately connected with Mr. Bruen, and doubtless main links in the chain which drew him away from New London. These were John Baldwin, Sen., and John Baldwin, Jun., of Milford, father and son, who married sisters, the daughters of Mr. Bruen: the elder Baldwin married the elder sister, Mary, in 1653; and the younger Baldwin, son by a former wife, and born in 1640, married the younger sister, Hannah Bruen, in 1663. Mr. Bruen's other daughter married Thomas Post, of Norwich.

Mr. Bruen does not appear on the records of Newark, as an office holder. The period of his death is uncertain, and his grave unknown. The latest information respecting him is derived from a letter written by him in 1680, to his son-in-law, Thomas Post of Norwich, which is recorded at New London as voucher to a sale of land, which it authorized. In that letter he refers to himself and wife, his son John and daughter Hannah, with their respective partners, as all in health. "It hath pleased God," he observes, "hitherto to continue our lives and liberties, though it hath pleased him to embitter our comforts by taking to himself our Reverend pastor, Mr. Pierson, Aug. 9th, 1679." He proceeds to state that the loss had been in some measure supplied. They had called and ordained Mr. Abraham Pierson, the son of their former pastor, "who follows the steps of his ancient father in godliness, praise to our God."

Peter Blatchford. Mr. Blatchford had been for eighteen years an inhabitant of New London, and always a servant of the town, as drummer, tax-gatherer, committee man, constable, list and rate maker, or town's attorney. In 1668, John Elderkin transferred to him a contract that he had made to build a grist-mill at Thirty-mile Island, in Connecticut River. To this settlement, which, in October of that year, the General Court made a plantation by the name of

¹ Samuel, son of Hugh Roberts, was afterward of Norwich.

Haddam, he removed. His homestead in New London, he alienated, June 15th, 1668, to Charles Hill, for £2 in hand, and £90 to be paid the fall ensuing. This proviso is added :

“ If P. B. is not able to despatch his affairs so as to carry away his family, he is to have the liberty of the house and barn till the spring of '69.”¹

It is probable that he effected his removal before the next spring, as in May, 1669, he was chosen deputy to the General Court from Haddam, and again in May, 1670. He died in 1671, aged forty-six. His wife was Hannah, daughter of Isaac Willey, and their children, Peter, Hannah and Joanna. No dates of marriage or of births have been found. The relict married Samuel Spencer, of Haddam, whose former wife was the widow of Thomas Hungerford, of New London.

Daniel Lane. Mr. Lane removed from New London in 1662 : he had been ten years an inhabitant, having married in 1652, Catharine, relict of Thomas Doxey. In 1666, he was one of the patentees to whom Governor Nicholls confirmed the grant of the town of Brookhaven, Long Island. Of his family there is no account in New London. The Doxey or Lane homestead was sold to Christopher Christophers, 1665.²

Robert Allyn, before coming to New London, had resided at least twelve years in Salem: he was there in 1637, a member of the church in 1642, and had three children baptized there, John, Sarah and Mary. After the settlement of Norwich, he had a house-lot in that plantation, was constable in 1669, and in deeds is styled “formerly of New London, but now of New Norridge.” After a time, relinquishing his house-lot to his son John, he returned to his farm, and at the time of his death was once more an inhabitant of New London. He died in 1683, being probably about seventy-five years of age. He was freed from training in 1668, an immunity not usually granted to men under sixty. The heirs to his estate were five children, viz., John ; Sarah, wife of George Geer ; Mary, wife of Thomas

¹ Blatchford's house-lot, afterward the Hill lot, and still later the Erving lot, fronted on State Street, and extended from the present Union to Huntington Street, including the site of the First Soc. Cong. Church.

² The house stood on the site of the old Wheat house, in Main street, taken down in 1861, and was perhaps a part of the same house.

Parke; Hannah, wife of Thomas Rose; and Deborah, then unmarried.

John, the only son of Robert Allyn, married, Dec. 24th, 1668, Elizabeth, daughter of John Gager. After the death of his father, he left Norwich and returned to the paternal farm, where he built a house and warehouse near the river, at a place since known as Allyn's Point.

*Hugh Caulkins*¹ was one of the party that came with Mr. Blinman, in 1640, from Monmouthshire, on the borders of Wales. He brought with him wife Ann and several children, and settled with others of the party, first at Marshfield, and then at Gloucester. At the latter place he was one of the selectmen from 1643 to 1648 inclusive, a commissioner for the trial of small causes in 1645, and deputy to the General Court in 1650 and 1651.²

In an account extant at Gloucester, reference is made to the time "when Hugh Caulkin went with the cattle to Pequot." This was doubtless in 1651, and it seems to intimate that in his removal he took the land route through the wilderness, and had charge of the stock belonging to the emigrant company. He dwelt at New London about ten years, and during that period was twelve times chosen deputy to the General Court, the elections being semi-annual. He was one of the townsmen from 1652 to 1661 inclusive. In 1660 he united with a company of proprietors associated to settle Norwich, and a church being organized at Saybrook previous to the removal, he was chosen one of its deacons. In 1663 and 1664, he was deputy to the court from Norwich. He died in 1690, aged ninety years. He is supposed to be the progenitor of most, if not of all, who bear the name in the United States.

He left two sons, John and David; ages unknown. John was one of the proprietors of Norwich; David, the youngest, remained at New London, and inherited his father's farm, at Nahantick, which is now owned by his descendants in a right line of the sixth generation.

John Elderkin was a mill-wright, ship-wright, and house-carpenter, and the general contractor for the building of mills, bridges and

¹ This name on the early records is most frequently written *Calkin*, but sometimes *Caulkin*: the *s* is never used. The latter mode of spelling the name is preferable, as indicating better the pronunciation.

² Babson, of Gloucester, MS.

meeting-houses, in New London, Norwich and the settlements in their vicinity, for a period of thirty-five years. He had been engaged in the same line in Massachusetts, before he came to Pequot; and can be traced as a resident in various places, pursuing these occupations. In a deposition of 1672, he states his age to be fifty-six, and that he came to New London the same year that Mr. Blinman's company came. This was early in 1651, when the town mill was built. Mr. Winthrop had solicited his services two years before, and had engaged Roger Williams to mediate in his favor, from which it may be inferred that Elderkin was then at Providence.¹ He built not only the first meeting-house in New London, but the second, which was erected in Mr. Bradstreet's time.

Mr. Elderkin was apparently a married man when he came to New London: he was at least a householder, and this supposes a family. But of this wife or of children by her there is no account on record. He married, after 1657, Widow Elizabeth Gaylord, of Windsor, and by her had several children. She had also two children by her first husband. Mr. Elderkin died at Norwich, June 23d, 1687; Elizabeth, his relict, June 8th, 1716, aged ninety-five.²

John Gager. At the time of Mr. Gager's death in 1703, he had been more than forty years an inhabitant of Norwich. His oldest son, John, born September, 1647, died in 1690, without issue. He was then of New London, as an occupant of the farm given by the town to his father. This farm lay on the river, south of Allyn's land, and was sold in 1696, to Ralph Stoddard, and has ever since been Stoddard land. John Gager, senior, left one son, Samuel, and six daughters, the wives of John Allyn, Daniel Brewster, Jeremiah Ripley, Simon Huntington, Joshua Abell, and Caleb Forbes.

Samuel Lothrop. Though Mr. Lothrop removed to Norwich about the year 1668, his farm "at Namucksuck, on the west side of the Great River," remained in the family until 1735, when his grandson, Nathaniel, having cleared the land of other claims, sold out to Joseph Powers,³ (260 acres, with house and barn, for £2,300, old tenor.)

¹ Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series, vol. 10, p. 280.

² In Hist. of Norwich, p. 117, the age and death of Elderkin's wife are given as his age and date of death. The error appears to have been caused by the omission of a line in printing.

³ Now Browning farm.

The two oldest children of Samuel Lothrop intermarried with the family of Robert Royce. John Lothrop (born December, 1646) married Ruth Royce; Isaac Royce married Elizabeth Lothrop, (born March, 1648,) December 15th, 1669; the double ceremony being performed by Daniel Wetherell, commissioner. Both couple removed to Wallingford, Conn. Samuel Lothrop died at Norwich, February 19th, 1700.

"Mrs. Abigail Lathrop died at Norwich, Jan. 23d, 1735, in her 104th year. Her father, John Done, and his wife, came to Plymouth, in 1630, and there she was born the next year. She lived single till sixty years old, and then married Mr. John Lathrop, of Norwich, [*mistake for Samuel?*] who lived ten years and then died. Mr. Lathrop's descendants at her decease were 365."¹

2 New England Weekly Journal: Boston, 1785.

CHAPTER XII.

Commissions and reports on the northern and western boundary.—Claims of Uncas long contested.—Indian deed of New London, 1669.—Prolonged contest with Lyme.—Contention at Black Point.—Bride Brook boundary.—Soldier grant.—Black Point Indians.—Traditions of a combat and a race.—Digression in regard to Lyme, Lady Fenwick's tomb and the graves of the fathers.

THE court grant of territory to Pequot, in May, 1650, fixed the extent on the north, at eight miles from the sea. This northern line, on the east side of the river, was determined by a town committee, in 1652. They began at a point on the Sound, four miles east of the river, and struck a line eight miles north, which ended at the head of the great pond a mile and a half north of Lantern Hill,¹ leaving the pond wholly within the bounds: from thence a west line crossed the head of Poquetannuck Cove, and came upon Mohegan River, opposite Fort Hill, at Trading Cove, a quarter of a mile above Brewster's trading-house.

In May, 1661, the General Court appointed a committee of three, Matthew Griswold, Thomas Tracy, and James Morgan, *to try*, that is, rectify the bounds of New London. "New London people," says the order, "have liberty to procure the ablest person they can to assist in this matter." The town appointed Daniel Lane and Ralph Parker. This committee reported October 28th.

"We began at the broad bay at Naihantik and soe upon a northerly lyne 8 miles up into the country, and then upon a due east lyne, and fell in upon the Mohegan country above, upon the side of the great plaine, where we marked a white oake tree on a hill, and another on the east side of the path that goes to New Norwige."²

1 This, instead of eight miles, must have been ten, from the southern shore.

2 This was at least eleven miles from the Sound. The north-west corner bound was in the present town of Salem.

Upon the boundary line east of the river, no report was made; and the amplitude of the measurement on the other side, offended the court. A note was sent to the town authorities, (Dec. 8th, 1661,) censuring them for not attending to their order in regard to the eastern line, adding:

"And you may hereby take notice that what hath been done in extending the bounds on the west side is directly cross to the expressed direction in the said order, respecting the bounds of the plantation."

The committee was hereupon sent to ascertain once more the northern line east of the river, which reported January 22d, 1661-2, declaring that they had measured "according to the best art of 8 myles by the chaine upon the ground as the land laye," and had fixed upon a bound-mark tree, at the cove near Mr. Brewster's, which stood upon an east and west line, from the north end of the hill on which Uneas had his fort. This varied but little from the measurement of 1652.

In October, 1663, the court issued a new commission on the western boundary, which was contested by Saybrook.

"Matthew Griswold, William Waller and Thomas Miner, are appointed to state the west bounds of New London, and Ensign Tracy and James Morgan or any other whom the two towns of New London and Norwich do appoint, are to see it done. They are to begin at some suitable place as they shall judge indifferent, that they may have as much land without as there is sea within."¹

The same committee or any two of them were empowered to settle with Uneas, and determine what compensation he should have for so much of his land as fell within the bounds of New London, and issue the case fully "Monday come 4 weeks, or as soon as may be." This order was obeyed without delay. The report says:

"We find that the end of the 8 miles into the Country falls right with the south side of the Trading Cove's Mouth upon New London river, by a direct east line from the corner tree of the west bounds.

"Secondly, Unkus his planting lands cometh on the south side, bounded with Cokichiwoke river,² from the footpath that leads to Mr. Brewster's eastward. And from the footpath west it goes away W. N. W. to the west bounds of N. L.

"Thirdly, we do determine that for Unkus his right from Cokichiwoke river south and so as the W. N. W. line runs, as also his whole right on the east side

¹ New London Records, book 6. It is to be hoped that the order was better understood then than it is now.

² Saw-mill Brook; Pequotice, Cochickuwock.

of the Great river within the bounds of New London, he the said Uncus or his assigns shall receive the full and just sum of fifteen pounds in some current pay."

The claim of Uncas is obscurely expressed in the above report. The sachem had been encouraged to look up his ancient rights, and now brought forward claims that had been heretofore both tacitly and expressly relinquished. He maintained that the land between the bound-mark tree on Cochikuwock brook, south to Mamacock, "was his father's land and so his," and that on the east side the town had taken in three miles of his land for which he had received no compensation; for all which his demand was now £20 in current pay, which the committee reduced to £15.

This report, assenting to these claims, exasperated the town. The inhabitants rose as one man against it. They had repeatedly satisfied Uncas for his lands west of the river, and to the Pequot country on the east side, they would not allow that he had any right whatever. A town meeting was called October 26th, which passed the following vote:

"Cary Latham and Hugh Roberts are chosen by the towne to meet the men chosen by Court order to settle our towne boundes (Oct. 8. 62) whoe are from the towne to disallow any proceedings in laying out of any boundes for us by them."

Dec. 14th, a meeting was held in which more pacific counsels prevailed. It was agreed that the £15 should be raised by a town rate and paid to Uncas, on condition that he would give a quit-claim deed for all land within the bounds of New London. But public opinion in the town would not sustain this vote, and the rate could not be levied. The inhabitants refused also to pay the expenses of the court committee, Messrs. Griswold, Waller and Minor, until enforced by an order of the court.¹

In May, 1666, the complaint of Uncas was carried before a committee of the Legislature, which sanctioned his claims, and approved of his demand of twenty pounds.

"And [we] do advise the towne to pay him the said sum for the establishment of a clearer title, preservation of peace and preventing further trouble and charge to themselves or the country."

The town however would not immediately yield the point, and the

¹ Colonial Records, vol. 1, p. 419.

case was brought before the Particular Court, held at New London in June. Mr. Winthrop, the governor of the colony appears to have favored one party, and Major Mason, the deputy governor, the other. To the town agents, Cary Latham and James Rogers, Governor Winthrop forwarded from Hartford a copy of the agreement with Uncas in 1654, and also gave his testimony in respect to the covenant made with the Indians on the first laying out of the town. In writing to Cary Latham, he says :

" You know that at the first beginning when we had all the Indians together, and challenged the Pequot bounds to Mohegan, Uncas then had no pretence to any lying on this side the Great Cove, and much less to any of the Pequot country on the east side the Great River."¹

Governor Winthrop's Letter to Mr. James Rogers.

" Loving friend

" Since you went home I found a writeing which I tould the Court I was sure there was such a writing which I could not then finde which doth clearly show that the business which now Uncas doth again contend for was with his owne consent issued 12 years since, and that then Uncas did not so much as challenge anything towards New London farther than the brooke called Co-chichuack which is at the Great Coave between the Saw Mill and Monhegan. I send herewith a coppie of that writeing. I have the original of the Majors owne hand and Uncas his hand is also to it, as you will see. I keepe the original writeing and this is certain that at that time Uncas had not the least pretence to any part of the east side of the river, within New London bounds. For if he had he would then have challenged when we agreed about the bounds at Cochiehuack that Uncas was contented should be as far as he could challenge for Mohegan lands. Neither did that take away the boundes of the towne further towards Monhegan if they should agree with Uncas for any part or the whole of it, to the full extent of the bounde, but there was not the least claime to any parte of the east side of the river within the Pequot country where the boundes do goe of N L. I hope it will not be possible to be seen that Uncas should againe have cause to make a new claime within the towne boundes after such an issue, under his owne hand mark in testimony of his satisfaction therein. Not else at present but my loving remembrance to yourself and all yours and rest your loving friend



" Hartford, June 4th, 1666.

" I sent this copy by my sonn Palmes and desired him to leave it if he went into the Bay."

The document forwarded was an agreement made with Uncas, June 10th, 1654, by John Winthrop, John Mason and Matthew Griswold, fixing the northern boundary of Nameug at Cochickuwock Brook, "where the foot path to Monhegon now goeth over the brook or cove," and from thence it was to run upon a west-north-west line indefinitely into the wilderness.

These papers were exhibited in court and recorded, but the difficulty with Uncas was left unsettled. In June, 1668, James Avery and Cary Latham were appointed by the town to treat with the sachem, and make a final settlement of the boundary line. This resulted in the payment to Uncas of fifteen pounds,¹ and in procuring from him a formal deed, which confirmed the bounds of the town as already laid out both east and west of the river.

We learn from tradition, that at the signing of this deed, the whole Mohegan tribe was assembled; that Uncas and his son Owaneco appeared in barbaric splendor, arrayed in a motley garb of native costume and English regimentals; that the whites flocked in from the neighborhood, either as curious witnesses of the sport, or sharers in it, and two or three days were spent in feasting, frolicking and games.

On the east side of the river, Poquetannuck Cove was the commencing point of the northern boundary line. The General Court subsequently ordered that the land near this boundary line which had not been granted to particular persons, should for the present lie common to the towns of New London and Norwich. Mr. Benjamin Brewster, then the principal resident on this tract, was left at liberty to connect himself with either of the two that suited his convenience. He preferred to belong to Norwich.

The town was agitated by a controversy still more unhappy in regard to its western boundary. Winthrop had originally fixed upon Bride Brook as the limit of his plantation, and the General Court had allowed of this extent, provided it did not come within the territory of Saybrook; that is, within five miles east of Connecticut River. The inhabitants were, perhaps, too ready to assume that this boundary did not entrench upon their neighbors. Relying upon the court grant, they regarded the land between Nahantick Bay and Bride Brook, which included Black Point and Giant's Neck, as their own,

¹ The payment of this gratuity was assumed by James Avery, Daniel Wetherell and Joshua Raymond, who were indemnified by the town with each two hundred acres of land.

and freely scattered their grants in that direction. The people of Saybrook, after a time, advancing with their claims toward the east, asserted that the Bride Brook boundary included a mile or more of their territory, and they also disposed of lands in the disputed tract. A new township was about to be formed out of that part of Saybrook which lay east of the river, (to be called Lyme,) and the bounds being considered narrow, they were eager to extend it east as far as possible, and would gladly have had it reach Nahantick Bay. Committees were appointed by the two parties from year to year, but without any approach toward a settlement of the question. New London sustained the contest with warmth and energy.

" At a towne meeting Nov. 21. 1664.

" Will you join as one man to beare all charges in seeking our right of that land that lyes in suspense betwixt us and Seabrooke.

" Agreed upon and voated yf they would.

" James Morgan, Ralph Parker and James Bemas are desired to make a lyne for tryall of what land lyes betwixt us and Seabrooke boundes.

" James Rogers and Ensigne Averye are desired to manage the business betwixt us and Seabrooke."

" Jan. 9, 1664-5.

" Captin Winthrop¹ and Mr. Edward Palmes are chosen by the Towne to manage the business betwixt us and Seabrook about the land in suspense—allowing them liberty to make choyce of one Atturnaye or more to assist them and to take such of the inhabitants also along with them as they shall see most needful to assist."

In 1667, the town authorized Mr. John Allyn of Hartford, Mr. Palmes, Mr. Wetherell, and the partners, Hill and Christophers, of New London, to recover the rights of the town and settle the boundary "according to ancient grants of the court," at their own charge; engaging, in case of success, to remunerate them with three hundred acres each, at Black Point. They also pledged two hundred acres for the use of the ministry, and two hundred as a personal gift to Mr. Bradstreet.

This commission led to no result; and the town subsequently intrusted the business to their deputies, who were to obtain the assistance of an attorney. Sergeant Thomas Minor was also requested "to be helpful to them." These agents entered into an agreement

1 This was Fitz-John Winthrop, eldest son of the governor. He had spent some time in England, and was there captain of a troop of horse. About this time Wait-Still Winthrop was chosen captain of the train-band in New London, so that both brothers had the title of captain.

with those of Lyme at Hartford, in which they not only relinquished all claim to the disputed mile, but gave up also a certain portion of Black Point, which had always been regarded as legitimately within the bounds of New London. This document, interchangeably signed and attested, was presented to the Legislature, and sanctioned by that body, before it was exhibited to the town of New London. When the deputies came home and reported what they had done, a storm ensued. The inhabitants indignantly refused to ratify the agreement.

"In towne meeting June 26. 1668.

"The towne by voat have protested against the agreement made by our deputie Leftenant Avery and Cary Latham with the men of lime, Mathew Griswell and Wiliam Waller about the land at our west bounds as being wholly unsatisfied with that agreement that they made which was in a paper read to the towne or any other agreement by them made or yt they shall make for the towne to abridge theire former bounds, as granted by the Court formerly as aperes by record."

After this period, the town intrusted the management of the business to Mr. Palmes, Mr. Condy and Mr. Prentis; prohibiting them however from any settlement of the boundary line, that did not conform to "the ancient grant of the court," and particularly directing them to recover Black Point, of which, they say, "we have been wrongfully deprived by the inhabitants of Seabrooke."

In May, 1671, the town annulled all former grants made by them of land at Black Point, except a farm to Mr. Bradstreet, a farm to Mr. John Allyn and three hundred and twenty-five acres to the ministry of the town. This last tract, which they declared to be sequestered for the use of the ministry *forever*, is said to lie at "our west bounds at Black Point." It was in fact the same land that in the agreement of 1668, had been reserved for the use of the ministry in Lyme. A committee of eight resolute men, two of them officers of the train-bands, were appointed to survey and lay out this farm. These measures intimate that the agitation on both sides was advancing toward a crisis. Accordingly, an explosion took place in August, ludicrous and grotesque in its features, but in its consequences salutary. It cooled the air, and satisfied those on both sides who were disposed to resort to force, leaving the way clear for a more rational issue of the dispute. This outbreak calls for especial notice, since it came about as near to a civil war as the inhabitants of the steady-habited land have ever been known to advance.

The people of New London and Lyme were both determined to

mow the grass on a portion of the debatable land—the twenty-five acres of meadow belonging to the ministry farm. Large parties went out from both towns for the purpose, and having probably some secret intimation of each other's design, they met on the ground at the same time. The conflict that ensued of tongues, rakes, scythes, clubs, and fisticuffs, though the actors were in good earnest, and thoroughly enraged, appears to have been more clownish and comic, than fearful or sublime. The account we have of it is taken from the testimony of witnesses on the trial of the rioters in March, 1661-2. No evidence appears to have been more dispassionate than that of Mr. Palmes. He was then living on his farm at Nahantick Bar, and when the New London party came along on their way to mow the marsh, he joined them, for no other purpose, he said, than to act as a pacifier if any struggle should take place. The Lyme men, under their usual leaders, Matthew Griswold and William Waller, were in possession of the ground when the other party advanced, led on by Clement Minor and supported by Mr. Palmes, the peace-maker. Constables were in attendance on either side, and Messrs. Griswold and Palmes were in the commission of the peace and could authorize warrants of apprehension on the spot. As the New London men approached, and swinging their sythes began to mow, the Lyme constable drew nigh, with a warrant for the apprehension of Ensign Minor, which, beginning to read, Sergeant Beeby interrupted him, crying out, "We care not a straw for your paper." Others of the company added contemptuous expressions and mockeries, on which the constable, shouting to his party, demanded their aid in arresting Clement Minor. The Lyme men on the instant came rushing forward, waving their weapons, while the New London party brandishing theirs, threatened to mow down any one that should touch their leader. The constable, however, had grasped his man, and a general tumult of shouts, revilings, wrestlings, kicks and blows followed. The weapons seem to have been pretty generally abandoned; though one of the Lyme company, Richard Smith, was knocked down with a pitchfork, and John Baldwin, of New London, was accused of bruising another person with a cudgel. Major Palmes, in retaliation of the arrest of Minor, furnished a warrant for the apprehension of Griswold, but he was not captured. The noisy encounter was terminated, without any serious injury on either side. The cooler heads among them succeeded in pacifying the rest. Ensign Minor, the only captive taken, was released on the spot. Messrs. Palmes, Griswold and Waller, having agreed to let the law decide the controversy,

"drank a dram of seeming friendship together," and all retired quietly from the field.

Each party subsequently indicted the other for assault, violence and riotous practices, and on account of the difficulty of finding an impartial and uninterested court and jury in New London county, they were tried—twenty-one men of New London and fifteen of Lyme—at Hartford. A penalty of nine pounds was imposed upon New London, and five pounds upon Lyme, but both fines were afterward remitted by the clemency of the General Court.¹

It was at the trial of this case, March 12th, 1671-2, that Governor Winthrop's deposition was produced, in which he referred to the romantic nuptials at Bride Brook, in the infancy of the plantation, as heretofore related. With respect to the original western boundary, he makes, in substance, the following statement :

"When we began a plantation in the Pequot country, now called New London, I had a commission from the Massachusetts, and the ordering of matters was left to myself. Not finding meadow sufficient for even a small plantation, unless the meadows and marshes west of Nayantick river were adjoined, I determined the bounds of the plantation should be to the brook, now called Bride brook, which was looked upon as certainly without Saybrook bounds. This was an encouragement to proceed with the plantation which otherwise could not have gone on, there being no suitable accommodation near the place."

The tract of land so long controverted, was about two miles in width, and now forms a part of East Lyme. The General Court ordered five miles to be measured east from Connecticut River, and four miles west from Pequot River, and the space between to be divided between the rival towns. This brought Black Point within the bounds of New London. An order on the town book, April 8th, 1672, directs the ministry farm at Black Point to be immediately laid out, "the rights of the town being recovered." This is the first allusion to the difficulty on the town books since May, 1671, no mention being there made of the mowing riot. The grantees of New London, whose lands fell within the bounds assigned to Lyme, were indemnified elsewhere.

A great part of the tract thus freed from claims and suits had been occupied by the Indians. Some of these were now accommodated with lands by Lyme in the northern part of their plantation on Eight Mile River. Those residing on Black Point were allowed by New

¹ This affair at Black Point has been called a riot; it was rather a fracas, or hub bub.

London to remain, and to occupy, on lease, 240 acres of upland, at an annual rent of three bushels of Indian corn per acre. For a number of years afterward, this little Indian community, contrary to most others when overshadowed by a higher degree of civilization, prospered and increased in numbers. About the year 1740 they were estimated at forty families. They have since been constantly diminishing, and are now tottering on the verge of extinction.

The difficulties with Lyme continued several years longer in the form of a series of vexatious lawsuits. In 1685, the town granted to Major Palmes 350 acres of land in remuneration "for the charges and disbursements of many years, particularly in sustaining a course of law with the town of Lyne concerning the west bounds." John Prentis had 200 acres for similar services. Among individual claimants to the debatable land the longest and most energetic contest was maintained between Christopher Christophers and Thomas Lee. Both towns became partizans in this protracted suit. The rival claimants came to an agreement June 3d, 1686, by which Lee relinquished his claim to "the land on Black Point possessed by the Nahanticks, Hammonassetts and Mejuarnes," which is said to lie "next to the Giant's land."

The Hammonassetts were a clan of eight families who had exchanged their lands in the neighborhood of Guilford for a settlement on Black Point. The Giant's land was a lot on the point laid out several years before by Matthew Griswold and Thomas Bliss, agents of the town of Saybrook, to an Indian surnamed *the Giant*, and honored with the gigantic name of Mamaraka-gurgana. It is probable that Mejuarnes was another name for this formidable personage. He is supposed to have resided originally at Giant's Neck, and to have exchanged this place for the land on the point. The two sons of the Giant were Paguran and Tatto-bitton. The latter, after the decease of his brother, sold what was left of the Giant's land to Christopher Christophers, July 1st, 1687.¹

North of Black Point, on Nahantick Bay, was the soldier grant. This was a tract given to five of Capt. Mason's companions in the Pequot War, in lieu of a grant made to them in 1642, of "500 acres in the Pequot country;" by which vague phrase, the vicinity of Pequot Harbor appears to have been understood. The grant being

¹ The Christophers land on Black Point was sufficient for two or three moderate farms. A considerable part of it fell by inheritance to the children of Thomas Mawaring, whose wife was a Christophers.

neglected and the land otherwise occupied, the General Court in 1650, transferred the gratuity of the soldiers to *Niantecutt*. The town record says :

"The land granted to Lieutenant Thomas Bull and other well deserving soldiers lyeth at a place called Sargent's Head."

Sergeant's Head, called by the Indians Pataquonk, was a hill of moderate elevation above the sand-bar, on the bay. From thence the soldier land extended west to a fresh pond, to which the name of Soldier's Reward was given. On the south-west of this, a tract of 100 acres had been secured to the Hammonassett, and was called, from the name of their chief, Obed land. The soldier grant, having been laid out so as to include the Obed land, an exchange was effected by the General Court, and 200 acres added to the grant on the north side as a compensation for the 100 relinquished on the south. The Hammonassett, however, sold their reservation to the proprietors of the grant, March 9th, 1691-2.¹ Three days later, (March 12th, 1692,) Joseph and Jonathan Bull of Hartford, who appear at this time to have been the sole proprietors of the tract, conveyed the Obed land and 700 acres north of it to Nehemiah Smith, of New London.²

Before leaving the subject of these border difficulties it may be well to notice the manner in which, according to time-honored legends, the question was settled. Tradition asserts that the issue was brought about, not by committees, courts, or legislative enactments, but by a trial of skill and strength between champions selected for the purpose, which was regarded as *leaving it to the Lord to decide*.

The account given by Dr. Dwight in his travels, who regards it as authentic history, is as follows :

"The inhabitants of both townships agreed to settle their respective titles to the land in controversy, by a combat between two champions to be chosen by each for that purpose. New London selected two men of the names of Picket and Latimer: Lyme committed its cause to two others, named Griswold and Ely. On a day mutually appointed, the champions appeared in the field, and fought with their fists, till victory declared in favor of each of the Lyme combatants. Lyme then quietly took possession of the controverted tract, and has held it undisputed, to the present day. This it is presumed, is the only instance, in which a public controversy has been decided in New England by pugilism."

¹ It is probable that the Hammonassett emigrated elsewhere, but their subsequent history has not been traced.

² Thomas Bradford, the brother-in-law of Mr. Smith, was his partner in the purchase.

Another version of the story is, that the line was settled by a race instead of a pugilistic contest. The champions are said to have started at the same moment from either side of the disputed tract, and the line was run north and south from the point where they met. The Lyme men being the swiftest of foot obtained the largest portion.

It ought to be observed that all written accounts of this judicial combat, are of comparatively recent origin, and there is no allusion to any such contest on the records of either town. It can not therefore have any weight as historic truth. As a matter of curiosity or superstition, among individuals, some such ordeal may have been tried, but it is quite improbable that the two towns decided their boundary question in this manner. New London always insisted that it should be determined "according to ancient grants of the court," referring to Bride Brook, where the god Terminus had been set up.

A short digression respecting the early inhabitants of Lyme may not be inappropriate in this connection. Lyme was originally a part of Saybrook; the first grantees were the inhabitants of Saybrook town plot, and among the earliest proprietors names are found belonging to that company from Saybrook, which removed in 1659 and 1660, to Norwich: viz., Thomas Adgate; Thomas Bliss, (whose Lyme land was sold to Richard Smith;) Morgan Bowers; Francis Griswold, (an early proprietor on "Bride Plaine;") John Holmsted; Simon and Christopher Huntington, (the latter sold to John Borden;) Captain John Mason; John Reynolds, (who sold Dec. 8d, 1659, to Wolston Brockway,) and Richard Wallis. These original proprietors of Lyme were all afterward of Norwich.¹ Their places in Lyme were mostly filled by settlers of a later generation.

According to tradition the first actual occupant in Lyme was Matthew Griswold. His title must have emanated from Col. George Fenwick, but the grant can not now be found on record. It consisted of a fine segment of land, washed by the Sound and the river, at the south-west extremity of the present town, and is said to have been a fief or feudal grant, held upon the tenure of keeping the monument of Lady Fenwick,² the deceased wife of the colonel, in good repair.

¹ President Styles in his Itinerary mentions a curious tradition respecting the proprietors of Norwich—that they were driven from their ancient habitations in Lyme and Saybrook by *black-birds*.

² Lady Alice Fenwick was the daughter of Sir Edward Apsley Knight; her first husband was Sir John Butler, (or Butler,) and as a matter of courtesy she retained her title, after her marriage to Col. Fenwick.

Of this there is no proof. Yet certain it is that the Griswold home-stead was favorably situated for the pious office of keeping watch over the Fenwick tomb. No calamity could happen to it, which might not be observed from various parts of the Black-Hall domain.

Lady Fenwick died in Saybrook about the year 1648. The precise date has not been ascertained; nor is there any cotemporary record, that speaks directly of her death. She was buried on the brow of the river bank, in a spot supposed to have been within the inclosure of the old wooden fort constructed by Lion Gardiner in 1635, and destroyed by fire in 1647. The fort was rebuilt of earth and stone, on another knoll of the bank, but time has reduced this also to a level with the surface, and nothing remains of it but some slight traces of a ditch and embankments. The monument of Lady Fenwick is constructed of a greyish red sandstone—the color of the Portland quarries. The scroll or table-piece is entire, but the supporters are dilapidated, and the inscription, if it ever had any, is effaced.

This tomb is supposed to have been the workmanship of Matthew Griswold, to whose skill other monumental tablets of that day have been attributed. It may have been bespoken by Col. Fenwick, before he returned to England, but not completed at the time of his decease in 1657. A receipt is registered at Saybrook, dated April 1st, 1679, wherein Matthew Griswold, Senior, acknowledges having received

"The full and just sum of seven pounds sterling, from the agent of Benjamin Batten, Esq., of London, in payment for the tomb-stone of the Lady Alice Butler, late of Saybrook."

Had this monument been completed before the death of Col. Fenwick, his wealth, his high and honorable character, and the large estate he had in Connecticut, forbid the supposition that payment would have been so long delayed. Was it, in point of fact, ever completed? Is there any proof that it ever contained any inscription? Mr. Griswold perhaps expected an inscription to be sent from England, which never arrived.¹ The general opinion has in-

¹ In the ancient burial place at New London, some of the stones were set before the inscription was cut, as is ascertained from notes made by the graver at the time, in his journal or diary. There are two sandstone tables which it is presumed he left unfinished at the time of his death. On one the inscription is just commenced, and the other is left like the Fenwick tomb, entirely void of a record.

deed been, that the tomb once exhibited a record, but that time has effaced the letters. Dr. Dwight said of it in 1810:

"The sandstone of which it is built, is of so perishable a nature, that the inscription has been obliterated, beyond the remembrance of the oldest existing inhabitants."

If this statement be correct, the letters were entirely worn out within seventy or eighty years from the time they were cut. Yet the red sandstone of the country, instead of perishing so readily, is found in other cases to grow harder by exposure, and to preserve inscriptions with tenacity. To the handiwork of Matthew Griswold, is also attributed the monument which covers the remains of his father-in-law, Henry Wolcot, in the burial ground at Windsor, which is of similar stone with the Fenwick table, and probably quite as old—Wolcot died in 1655—but the inscription is entirely legible. If the Fenwick epitaph was worn out in eighty years, would this be entire at the end of two centuries?

One would indeed wish to believe that something commemorative and appropriate, had been inscribed on the tomb of Lady Alice. It is adding sorrow to desolation, when we assume that it was left unfinished, uninscribed, erected by stranger hands on a distant shore.

The solitude, the stern and dreary simplicity of the monument, present a vivid contrast to the history of the gentle lady it was designed to commemorate—nobly born and delicately nurtured in the bosom of English refinement, and under the shadow of English oaks. A dark stone tablet, with a heavy scroll half-broken down; without ornament, without inclosure; nothing over, or around, but the hill, the vaulted heavens, and the waters murmuring along the shore; lying bleak and lonely on the river's brink, looking out toward the melancholy sea, and suggesting the thought that the fair exile had died longing to behold once more her island home—such is the Fenwick tomb.

When a town is to be organized, the preliminary step is the choice of a constable. It is the first act of self-government—an unfurling of the banner of independence by a subordinate district. Accordingly, when Saybrook was to be divided, and the east side prepared to set up for itself, an order authorizing them to choose and qualify such an officer, was issued by a court of assistants held at New London May 31st, 1664—Deputy Governor Mason, and Messrs. Talcott, Bruen and Avery on the bench.

"This Court apprehending a necessity of government on the east side of the river of Seabrooke do order that the inhabitants of Seabrooke meet forthwith and make choice of a Constable for the use of the Country and the inhabitants on the said east side, and the oath to be administered by Mr. Chapman.

"Also that the people at such times and seasons as they cannot go to the public ordinance in the town on the other side, that they agree to meet together at one place every Lord's day at a house agreed upon by them, for the sanctification of the Sabbath in a public way, according to [the command of] God.

"And this Court desires the selectmen of Seabrook to see that children and servants through these limits be catechised and instructed according to order of Court."

On the 18th of Feb., 1665-6, articles of agreement were entered into between the two divisions of Saybrook, preparatory to what they style "*a loving parting*." The preamble states that—

"The inhabitants east of the river desiring to be a plantation by themselves do declare that they have a competency of lands to entertain thirty families."

The Lyme committee that signed the parting covenant were:

" Matthew Griswold,	William Waller,
Reinold Marvin,	John Lay Senr.,
Richard Smith,	John Comstock."

The new township was called *Lyme*, a name derived from Lyme Regis on the coast of Dorsetshire, a small port, from whence probably Mr. Griswold, if not others of the planters, took his departure from England. This name was sanctioned by the Legislature in May, 1667. The first land records, after the town was organized, are attested by Matthew Griswold and Reinold Marvin. The latter died in 1676 at the early age of forty-two, and the name of Thomas Lee succeeds as the land comissioner.

The first settlers of Lyme were mostly of the second generation of emigrants from Europe. Matthew Griswold must be excepted, the patriarch, and for a long term of years the principal magistrate of the town. Thomas Lee, Henry Champion and John Lay must also be reckoned of the first generation. Henry Champion died in 1708, verging toward the age of one hundred years. John Lay died in 1675; in his last will and testament he says, "being grown aged." His son John Lay, Jun., was born in 1633, probably on the other side of the water. By a second wife he had a second son *John*,—both of them living at their father's decease. Thomas Lee

came to America in the family of his father, in 1640 or 1641, probably then a youth.¹

Mr. Griswold died in Dec., 1698, or in Jan., 1698-9, and was over eighty years of age. No memorial of his grave has been found. It would be satisfactory could we discover but a rude stone, and a few letters to note the death-day and the resting-place of one whose chisel had so often carved memorials for others. There is always satisfaction in finding a stone with its record at the head of a grave, even when we feel no special interest in the tenant that lies beneath. It seems to say that love and respect followed the departed one to his narrow home, and did not suddenly terminate there. But in the first era of our country, the absence of an inscribed stone is no evidence of neglect or indigence. Men who are skillful to work in stone are seldom found in a new country, and labor is engrossed with occupations necessary to the living.

Thomas Lee died in 1705:² his burial place is also shrouded in obscurity. These are not mentioned as solitary instances. Every where in our country we miss the graves of the fathers. The first generation and many of the second seem to have dropped silently and unnoticed into the bosom of the earth. It is indeed of slight importance, since we have other memorials more honorable and lasting than those of stone, to attest the character of those much enduring men.

Tradition relates that the meadows and corn-fields along the river in southern Lyme, were first cultivated by armed men, who came over from Saybrook, with guns and pikes, as well as agricultural implements, to mow the marshes and to plant and gather the harvest. Mr. Griswold, it is said, was the first to build a habitation on that side, and this being occupied for several years solely by his negro servants, was familiarly called Black-Hall, a name which was at first retained to designate the Griswold lands, but is now the sectional term for the district in which they lie. The location of Black-Hall Point is very beautiful; the land slopes to the Sound and projects so far into it that in winter the sun rises and sets over the water. Every

1 A manuscript account of the Lee family says: "In 1641 came Mr. Brown from England with Thomas Lee and wife and three children; the wife of Lee was Brown's daughter. Lee died on the passage with small-pox; his wife and children came to Saybrook."

2 The will of Ensign Thomas Lee, Senior, was proved Feb. 19th, 1704-5.

sail that passes through the Sound is in full view, and often on a fine day fifty or more may be seen at one time.¹

North of Black-Hall, "between the rivers," as it is locally called, that is, between Black-Hall Creek and Duck Creek, both emptying into Connecticut River, John Lay and Isaac Waterhouse were probably the earliest settlers. The latter was the oldest son of Jacob Waterhouse, of New London; he purchased in 1667, all the lands of Major Mason, in Lyme. In this district, on a high bleak hill, three meeting-houses were built in succession. A bold position for a church, high and solitary, towering almost over Saybrook itself, saluting every passing sail within a wide sweep of vision, and indicating even to the inhabitants of Long Island, with its heaven-pointed finger, the region of happiness.

The first meeting-house on this breezy height was erected about 1670. In a new plantation the buildings are necessarily rude and incomplete; destined soon to give place to others. This first church arrived at old age in fifteen years. The inhabitants could not agree on the site for its successor, and were obliged to call in magistrates from abroad to compose their differences and settle the disputed point. The report of these arbitrators is so honorably characteristic of the magistracy of that age, that it well deserves to be quoted entire. It is the spirit of Puritanism, condensed into an example.

"The Agreement about the Meeting-House."

"Whereas by the General Court May last we were appointed to hear and determine a controversy between the inhabitants of Lyme concerning the place where the next meeting-house shall stand, and having seen the places desired by the several inhabitants, and having heard their several allegations and reasons why they would have the meeting-house stand in the places by them desired, and the returns they have been pleased to make one unto another thereupon, and seriously considered of the premises, in order to the putting of a final issue to the case, we saw reason to pitch upon two places where to set the meeting-house, and with the consent of the greatest part of the people of Lyme, we, after calling upon the Lord, commended the decision of the case to a lot, which lot fell upon the southermost we had appointed, which is upon the hill where the now meeting-house stands, more northerly in the very place where we shall stake it out, and we do order and appoint the said meeting-house to be erected: and now, worthy and much respected friends, we have according to our best judgment led you to an issue of your controversy; we request and advise you to lay aside all former dissatisfaction that has risen amongst you in the management of this affair hitherto, and that [illegible] be buried and for-

¹ Mr. Matthew Griswold, the present occupant of Black-Hall, informed the author that on a fair, calm morning he had counted one hundred sail of vessels within sight.

gotten by you and never more revived by any amongst you, and that you do forthwith in the best time and manner you can, join heart and hand in the building and erecting a meeting-house in the place by the special providence of God stated and laid out to you for that purpose, and desire the favorable acceptance of our desires and endeavors to promote your peace, and that the God of peace may direct you into ways of peace and good agreement, that his presence and blessing may be your portion, which is the heart's desire of your friends,

" JOHN TALCOTT,
" JOHN ALLIN."

" This day in Lyme, June 4th, 1686."

[From Lyme Records, Book 1.]

CHAPTER XIII.

From 1670 to 1690.—General View.—Indian War.—Account of the expeditions from New London county.—Death of Governor Winthrop.—Erection of the second meeting-house.—Illness and death of Mr. Bradstreet.—Transient ministers.—Popularity of Mr. Saltonstall.—His ordination.—Heat and disease—Sir Edmund Andross.—Meeting-house burnt.—The third or Saltonstall meeting-house built.

EVERY glimpse that is now obtained of the plantation exhibits enterprise, and a slowly growing prosperity. But the growth of towns in that day was gradual, a struggle for life, bearing no resemblance to the rapid expansion of American settlements in later days. In 1670, the list of the town was but £8,506, and seven years later, (after the Indian war,) it was less, £8,206. Hartford, Windsor, Wethersfield, New Haven, and even Fairfield and Milford were before New London. Property was here more uncertain than in most other towns. The comers and goers were many, and names incidentally appear upon the records which are never heard of afterward. New London had peculiar characteristics for that day, a floating, wavering, self-confident populace, inured to the hardships of the sea, to artisan labor, and the tillage of a stubborn soil, but easily drawn aside to recreation, and we infer from the complaints against them, noisy and litigious. The character of the town long reflected these peculiar features ; but amid the changeful elements, a substantial class of worthy citizens were always to be found ; men who were neither fickle, nor contentious, nor irreligious, but of the genuine, New England stamp ; felling the forest and subduing the reluctant earth ; toiling in the work-shop, or pulling at the oar ; now gathering with right merry heart in the social circle, now governing the town, or with lowly veneration engaged in the worship of God.

It appears to have been the original plan of the town that the first line of dwelling-houses bordering the semi-circular shore, from the

head of Winthrop's Cove to the end of the point now known as Shaw's Neck, a distance of more than a mile and a half, should, as far as practicable, face the water, with an open street or quay in front of them. Had this design been carried out, a noble promenade would have been left along the shore, girdling the city with beauty, and presenting a fine picture seaward. All the first houses in Main and Bank Streets, were built on the west side of the street, while the east side, the shore, beach or marsh, that bordered the town, was left in common. From the eastern part of the Parade, where is now the Ferry wharf, the coast originally turned to the west, more abruptly than at present, and was bordered by a strip of sand-beach, inclosing a narrow, salt-water pond or marsh, which having been filled in and protected by a wall, forms the present Water Street. At the head of this beach were the ferry stairs and the old town landing-place, where in 1703, was built the town wharf. This site had been early chosen for town purposes, on account of its affording the easiest ascent to the area or platform of the town. Almost every street below this point, leading to the water, had an abrupt pitch to the shore, which time and highway labor have worn away. After 1670, the border of the cove running up to the mill, began to be occupied. The water-craft of that day being mostly sloops, or decked boats, found no difficulty in ascending nearly to the head of the cove, and shops or warehouses were soon erected along the western side, filling this part of the town with the hum of business. On the shore side of Bank Street, very few grants were made until about 1720. The town mainly consisted of two ends. Hence a distinction was early made and long continued between up-towners and down-towners. In later days, and no doubt immemorially, rivalry and feuds, challenges at playing ball, snow-balling, and occasional fights, took place between the boys of the two ends.

After 1666, for fifteen or twenty years, the commissioners (justices) for New London were almost invariably Messrs. Avery, Wethersell and Palmes. In 1674, Mr. Palmes was invested by the General Court with the superior power of a magistrate, through New London county and the Narragansett country. In military affairs, after the decease of Major Mason, Fitz-John Winthrop took the lead, and next to him were Palmes and Avery. In 1672, a company of troopers was raised, forty in number, of which Edward Palmes was appointed captain, John Mason, of Norwich, lieutenant,¹ and Joshua

¹ Son to Major Mason.

Raymond, cornet.¹ This was the first organized company of horsemen in the county.

The year 1675 brought with it the gloom and terror of an Indian war. After near forty years of quiet, following the vindictive struggle with the Pequots, the whole country was terror-struck with the news that a wide-spread combination of Wampanoags, Narragansetts, and other tribes had been formed, with the design and desperate hope of exterminating the white race from the land. Suddenly, before any effectual measures of defense had been concerted, Philip, with his fierce horde of warriors, burst out of the dark cloud like a thunder-bolt.

Connecticut, as well as the neighboring colonies, lay exposed to an immediate assault. Her eastern frontier was open to the Narragansetts; Norwich and Stonington were particularly in danger. Within her limits were bands of Indians, who might perhaps be induced to join the enemy, and one of these bands, the Mohegans, was at no time more powerful than at this juncture. Patronized by the Masons, and having his frontier protected by Norwich, Uncas had been for fifteen years increasing in numbers and strength. This wary sachem kept his neighbors for some time in doubt which party he would join in the contest. Messrs. Wetherell and Avery made him a visit on the 28th of June, to ascertain, if possible, how he stood affected to Philip's designs, and returned, apprehensive that he was leagued with the enemy. In Mr. Wetherell's letter to the governor, he says:

"We have reason to believe that most of his men are gone that way, for he hath very few men at home,"—"tis certain he hath lately had a great correspondence with Philip, and many presents have passed."²

On Sunday, June 24th, the first overt act of hostility was committed by Philip. Several houses were burned and men slaughtered at Swansey. It does not appear that the news reached New London till June 29th, when it was brought by a messenger on his way to Hartford, dispatched by Mr. Stanton to carry the fearful tidings to the governor. A thrill of horror ran through the community. Mr. Wetherell wrote urgently to Governor Winthrop, June 29th and 30th, for assistance.

¹ It was much the custom then to address people by their titles of office. Cornet Raymond is mentioned on the town books by his title, as naturally as Captain Palms by his.

² Mass. Hist. Coll., 8d series, vol. 10, p. 118.

"It is reported that Philip is very near us and expects further assistance from Uncas."

"We have great reason to believe that there is an universal combination of the Indians, and fear you cannot aid us timely. We are calling in all our out-livers, and shall by God's assistance, do our best for our defence, but hope that your Honor, with the rest of the honorable Council will despatch present supplies for our aid."¹

Major John Winthrop, the highest military commander in the county, was then dangerously ill, and this was calculated to increase the panic of the three eastern towns. The Council of War immediately dispatched forty men to their aid, and Captain Wait Winthrop being authorized to act both as a military commander and a commissioner, raised a considerable force, and marched directly into the Indian territory. Here he met the troops and commissioner sent from Massachusetts, and assisted in concluding a treaty with the Narragansetts, which quieted for a time the alarm of the eastern towns. The Mohegans, after some little hesitation, and the Pequots and Nanticks, with acceptable readiness, joined the English; and both eventually performed essential service.

During the summer the principal seat of the war was in the interior of Massachusetts, and the towns on Connecticut River were the sufferers. But as winter approached, the hostile Indians concentrated their forces in the Narragansett territory, in dangerous proximity to the Connecticut frontier.

The military regulations enforced by the General Court in October were of a stern and vigorous cast, and embodied in terms of anxious solemnity. They were in fact equivalent to putting the whole colony under the ban of martial law. The most important enactments were these: sixty soldiers to be raised in every county—the Pequots to be assigned to the charge of Capt. Avery, and the Mohegans to Capt. Mason—places of defense and refuge to be immediately fortified in every plantation—neglect of orders in time of assault to be punished with death—no provisions allowed to be carried out of the colony without special license—and no male between the ages of fourteen and seventy, suffered to leave the colony without special permission from the council, or from four assistants, under penalty of £100.²

¹ Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series vol. 10, p. 119.

² These orders are recorded at New London with the following indorsement: "To y^e Constable of Norwitch, N. London, Stonington, Lyme, Kenilworth and Saybrooke, to be posted from Constable to Constable forthwith and published and recorded, and then to be returned to the Clarke of the County."

In compliance with the order respecting fortifications, a committee of seven persons was appointed in New London, Fitz-John Winthrop, James Rogers, William Douglas, William Hough, Christopher Christophers, Samuel Rogers and Thomas Beeby, who issued an order (October 28th) for six points to be immediately fortified, viz.:

1. The stone house at the mill, near Major Palmes and Samuel Rogers, for defense of that end of the town.
2. The houses of Mr. Christophers and Mr. Edgecombe, for defense of that neighborhood. (On Main Street, each side of Federal Street.)
3. Mr. Bradstreet's and the town house. (By the *town house*, probably the meeting-house was meant, which was near Mr. Bradstreet's.)
4. Mr. Charles Hill's. (On State Street, probably corner of Meridian.)
5. Mr. Joshua Raymond's. (Corner of Parade and Bank Streets.)
6. Mr. Ralph Parker's. (At the head of Close Cove, in the lower part of the town.)

New London, Norwich and Stonington were all partially fortified in this manner, and a constant guard was maintained. In the belfries of the meeting-houses, and on the high hills, watchmen were kept on the look-out, with sentry-boxes erected for their accommodation.¹

The United Colonies seem to have been pervaded with the idea that a crisis in their existence had arrived which demanded bold and immediate measures. To meet this crisis, they determined on a winter campaign, in which an overpowering force should be sent into the thickets of Narragansett, to attack the lion in his den. An army was raised of one thousand men. The proportion of Connecticut was three hundred and fifteen, who were placed under the command of Major Robert Treat, of Milford, and ordered to rendezvous at New London.

A town always suffers from being made a gathering-place for soldiers. New London was soon in a state of bustle and excitement, and, during the remainder of the war, continued to be a camp for the troops, a store-house for supplies, and a hospital for the sick—full of disturbance, discomfort and complaints.

The troops began to collect the latter part of November. Those

¹ A height overlooking Norwich green, is still known as Sentry Hill, from this circumstance.

from Fairfield and New Haven counties came mostly by water; those from other counties by land. New London county raised seventy men under Capt. John Mason, of Norwich, beside Pequots and Mohegans under Capt. Gallop. Of the seventy men, Norwich contributed eighteen; New London, Stonington and Lyme, forty; Saybrook, eight; Killingworth, four. The whole force was to be at New London Dec. 10th. Great exertions were made to obtain the requisite quantity of provisions and all the apparatus of war. Mr. Wetherell was the active magistrate, Joshua Raymond the commissary. Wheat was sent from other parts of the colony, here to be ground and baked. Indians were to be fitted with caps and stockings. The town also furnished a quantity of powder, bullets and flints, and ten stands of arms. At length there was an impressment of beef, pork, corn and rum, horses and carts, and the army marched.¹

These troops, forming a junction with those of the other colonies, were engaged in the fearful swamp fight at Narragansett,² Dec. 19th, 1675. A complete victory was here obtained over the savage foe, but at great expense of life on both sides. The number of Indians killed on the side of the enemy, was estimated at nearly a thousand. Of the English army, two hundred were killed and wounded, of whom eighty were of the Connecticut line—a large proportion out of three hundred and fifteen. The loss sustained by the friendly Indians (if any) is not included in this number.

The Mohegans in this fight were under the command of Capt. John Gallop, of Stonington, who was numbered among the slain. Capt. Avery had charge of the Pequots. It was afterward reported by some, that the Connecticut Indians would not fight in this battle, but discharged their guns into the air. This must be an error. Capt. Gallop, their gallant leader, was slain in the fury of the onset. No charge of cowardice or insubordination was brought against them after their return home; while on the contrary, rewards for faithful service were bestowed on several. In the accounts of the county treasurer, are notices of cloth and provisions dealt out to various individuals, after they came from the battle. Among these are the names of Momoho, Nanasquee, Tomquash and his brother—"corn delivered Cassasinamon's squaw," and "blew cloth for stockings to Ninnicraft's daughter's Captayne and his brother." Capt. John Mason, of Norwich, received a wound, with which he languished till the

¹ These particulars are gathered from accounts afterward presented for payment.

² Within the limits of the present town of South Kingston, R. I.

next September, and then died. The wounded men were mostly brought to New London to be healed, and were attended by Mr. Gershom Bulkley, the former minister of the town, who had accompanied the expedition in the capacity of surgeon.

In January, 1675-6, another army of one thousand men was raised. The Connecticut quota was again three hundred and fifteen; their leader Major Treat, and their rendezvous, New London. They began their march on the 26th, passed through Stonington into the Narragansett country, and from thence north-westerly into the Nipmuck region, clearing away the Indians in their course, but meeting with no opportunity to strike a heavy blow. Uncas himself accompanied this expedition; and the Council of War wrote to Mr. Bulkley to return thanks for their good service, to Uncas and Owaneco of the Mohegans, and to Robin Cassasinamon and Momoho of the Pequots.¹

During the winter, New London suffered exceedingly from the quartering of soldiers upon the inhabitants, and the great scarcity of provisions. In May, the General Court authorized the enlistment of three hundred and fifty men, as a standing army, to be in readiness for any service. This force, which was under the command of Major John Talcott, was almost immediately ordered into the field, Norwich at this time being designated as the gathering place. Mr. Wetherell and Mr. Douglas were the commissaries, and New London, for the third time, was a depot for supplies. The number of Indian auxiliaries engaged at this time was unusually large. Major Talcott left Norwich June 2d, and entering the wilderness marched directly toward the upper towns on Connecticut River, where the opportune arrival of so large a force, is supposed to have saved Hadley from Indian devastation.² Capt. George Denison had command of the company raised in New London county; Lieut. Thomas Lefingwell, of Norwich, and Ensign John Beeby, of New London, were with him. This company went up the river by water to Northampton, and from thence joined Major Talcott with supplies, of which the army was in pressing need. They had suffered so much on their route, that the soldiers gave it the name of *the long and hungry march*.³ Mr. Fitch, of Norwich, went with them as chaplain, and Mr.

¹ Conn. Colonial Records, vol. 2, p. 406.

² Trumbull's History of Connecticut.

³ Ibid. Major Talcott complained that the bread they had with them was all covered with blue mold, and adds expressively, "Bread made for this wilderness work had need be well dried." Conn. Colonial Records, vol. 2, p. 453.

Bulkley as surgeon. This army returned to Connecticut about June 10th, having scoured the country far up the river, but met with very few of the enemy. The Council of War ordered a coat to be given to every Indian out in this long march, "in regard (they observe) the service was tedious and little or no plunder gained."¹

After a few days' refreshment, this spirited army again entered the hostile districts, and marching first to the north-west of Providence, then turning to the south-east, explored the forests and necks down to Point Judith. From thence they returned through Westerly to Stonington and New London. In this expedition great havoc was made among the Narragansetts. Magnus, the old queen or sunk-squaw, was slain, and in two engagements, two hundred and thirty-eight Indians were killed and captured. Major Talcott, while at Warwick Neck, "having advice that Philip was beat down toward Mount Hope," would have pursued him to this haunt, if his Indian auxiliaries had not positively refused to accompany him.²

Major Talcott's little army, after a short dispersion and rest, was ordered to re-assemble at New London on the 18th of July. They marched again about the 20th, and made their way this time into the very heart of Plymouth colony. July 31st, they were at Taunton. From thence they returned homeward, but hearing that a large party of Indians who were taking their flight westward, into the wilderness, had committed some depredations on cattle and corn near Westfield, they immediately took the route thither, and pursuing the trail of the now forlorn and famished savages, they had a sharp and final struggle with them, beyond the Housatonick, in the route to Albany.³ The troops then returned to Connecticut, and on the 18th of August were ordered by the council to repair to their respective counties, and disband their men. Philip had been hunted down and slain (August 12th) by the Plymouth men, and the war was at an end.

Returning to an early period of the contest, we find that in February, 1675-6, commenced that series of forays, into the Indian territory, which issuing at short intervals from New London county, and led by those noted Indian-fighters, Denison and Avery, contributed in no small degree to the favorable result. These partisan bands were composed of volunteers, regular soldiers, Pequots, Mohegans,

¹ Conn. Colonial Records, vol. 2, p. 456.

² Letter of Talcott, in Colonial Records, vol. 2, p. 458.

³ In the present town of Stockbridge. (See Hubbard's Indian Wars.)

and Nahanticks—disorderly among themselves, but condensed against the foe—the Indians usually double the number of the whites, and more useful as scouts and plunderers, than in direct attack. It was in the third of these roving excursions, begun March 28th, and ended April 10th, 1676, that the brave Narragansett chieftain, Canonchet, was taken prisoner. This was one of the great exploits of the war. The unfortunate captive was brought to Stonington, and there put to death, after the Indian mode of execution, being shot by Owaneco, and two Pequot sachems, the nearest to his own rank among the conquerors.¹ This was done by the captors, without any waiting for advice, or reference to superior authority.²

The Indians taken in arms during this war, were generally executed. As far as those called warriors were concerned, it was a war of extermination. Quarter was seldom conceded, and death followed close upon capture and submission. This was the customary and legalized mode of proceeding in wars with savages, and regarded as the only safe course, the dictate of stern necessity. The women and children were saved, and either amalgamated with the Mohegans or distributed among the English for servants.

The signal service performed by these partisan bands, is thus acknowledged by Hubbard, the early historian of the Indian wars.

"The inhabitants of New London, Norwich and Stonington, apprehensive of their danger, by reason of the near bordering of the enemy, and upon other prudent considerations, voluntarily listed themselves under some able gentlemen, and resolute soldiers among themselves, Major Palmes, Capt. George Denison, Capt. Avery, with whom, or under whom, within the compass of 1676, they made ten or more several expeditions, in all which, at those several times, they killed and took two hundred and thirty-nine of the enemy, by the help and assistance of the Pequots, Mohegans, and a few friendly Narragansetts; besides thirty taken in their long march homeward, after the fort fight, December 19th, '75; and besides sixteen captivated in the second expedition, not reckoned within the compass of the said number; together with fifty guns, and spoiling the enemy of an hundred bushels of corn."

These expeditions had very much the character of marauding parties, or border raids. The English were generally mounted, and the

¹ Hubbard. The Pequot sachems were probably Cassasinamon and Momoho.

² Major Palmes, in a letter to the Council of War, dated April 5th, 1676, alluding to the death of the Narragansett sachem, says: "Might my opinion pass when there is no help, I apprehend it might have proved more for the public benefit if his execution had been deferred till your Honors had the intelligence first of his being seized." (Council Records.)

Indians on foot. The latter had no wages, but were recompensed with the plunder they obtained, a portion of the prisoners for servants, and various presents from the government. In most instances, the soldiers retained the booty and the captives that they brought home. Capt. Denison was the most conspicuous soldier of New London county. Captains Avery and Minor were also prominent in these excursions. Major Palmes, though active in the forwarding department, took the field but once, and that was in one of the flitting inroads into the Narragansett territory.¹

The statement has been sometimes made, that Connecticut lost no men on her own soil in Philip's War. This is an error. Five men, at least, within her limits, were sacrificed by sudden shot from a lurking foe.

1. Two men belonging to Norwich, Josiah Rockwell and John Reynolds, were slain on the 27th or 28th of January, 1675-6, on the east side of Shetucket River, which they had crossed for the purpose of spreading flax. Their bodies were found thrown down the river bank, with the usual Indian trophy taken from their heads. A young lad, the son of Rockwell, who was with them, could not be found, and was supposed to have been carried away as a prisoner, but he was never heard of afterward.²

2. John Kirby, of Middletown, was killed between Middletown and Wethersfield.

3. Edward Elmore, or Elmer, was slain in East Windsor.

4. Henry Denslow, slain in Windsor.

5. William Hill, of East Hartford, wounded but not killed.³

These were all in 1676.

John Winthrop, Esq., the patron and founder of New London, and governor of Connecticut for nearly eighteen years, died in Boston,

1 The summary given above, of the part taken by Connecticut in the contest with Philip, is partly drawn from the journal of the Council of War, from 1675 to 1678, preserved among the records of the colony, and recently printed in vol. 2, of the Colonial Records of Connecticut. (Hartford, 1852.)

2 An account of this tragedy was sent by Major Palms to the governor and council, in a letter dated Jan. 29th. He calls Rockwell's name Joseph, and gives fifteen or sixteen years as the age of the son. The author has ascertained that it was Josiah Rockwell that was slain, and his son Joseph, who was with him, was born in March, 1665.

3 The last four instances are mentioned in the examination of an Indian, named Menowniet, taken captive near Farmington. (Colonial Records, vol. 2, p. 471.) The name of John Kirby, not mentioned in the examination, is supplied by Mr. Judd, at whose instance, also, *Edward Elmore* is substituted for *G. Elmore*.

April 5th, 1676.¹ He had been called to Boston to attend the meeting of the commissioners, to which he was the delegate from Connecticut. His remains were deposited in the tomb of his father,² in the cemetery of King's Chapel, where afterward his two sons were gathered to his side. His wife, who deceased not long before him, is supposed to have been buried in Hartford.³

Governor Winthrop's family consisted of the two sons so often mentioned, Fitz-John and Wait-Still,⁴ and five daughters. The sons were residents in New London at the time of their father's decease. Wait-Still succeeded his brother as major of the county regiment,⁵ but at a period ten or twelve years later, removed to Boston. Lucy, the second daughter, the wife of Edward Palmes, belongs to New London; but her death is not on record, neither is there any stone to her memory in the old burial-ground, by the side of her husband. It is therefore probable that she died abroad, and from other circumstances it is inferred that this event took place in Boston, after the death of her father, in 1676.⁶ She left a daughter, Lucy, who was her only child, and this daughter, though twice married, left no issue. Her line is therefore extinct.⁷

The very extensive landed estate of Governor Winthrop, which fell to his two sons, was possessed by them conjointly, and undivided during their lives. Fitz-John, having no sons, it was understood between the brothers, that the principal part of the land grants, should be kept in the *name*, and to this end be reserved for John, the only son of Wait Winthrop. These possessions, briefly enumerated, were Winthrop's Neck, 200 acres; Mill-pond farm, 300; land north of the town on Alewife Brook and in its vicinity, 1,500; land at Pequonuck, (Groton) 6,000; Little-cove farm half a mile square on

¹ His will may be found in the registry of Suffolk county, Mass. It is also recorded in Hartford.

² Elliot's Biographical Dictionary.

³ She was living in March, 1670. Mass. Hist. Coll., 8d series, vol. 10, p. 79.

⁴ The adjuncts *Fitz* and *Still*, are very seldom used on the New London records.

⁵ This regiment, in 1680, consisted of 509 men.

⁶ The family of Major Palmes was in Boston during the Indian troubles. Mrs. Palmes was living, at the date of her father's will, April 8d, 1676, but in November, 1678, the minister of New London records the baptism of a child of Major Palmes, by a second wife.

⁷ The first husband of Lucy Palmes was Samuel Gray, a goldsmith, of New London—originally from Boston—who died in 1718. She afterward married Samuel Lynde, of Saybrook, being his second wife.

the east side of the river—these were within the bounds of New London. On Mystic River, five or six hundred acres; at Lanthorn Hill and its vicinity, 3,000; and on the coast, Fisher's Island and its Hommocks, and Goat Island. Governor Winthrop had also an undisputed title from court grants to large tracts in Voluntown, Plainfield, Canterbury, Woodstock and Saybrook, amounting to ten or twelve thousand acres. He also claimed the whole of what was called Black-lead-mine Hill in the province of Massachusetts Bay, computed to be ten miles in circumference. Magnificent as was this estate in point of extent, the value, in regard to present income, was moderate. By the provisions of his will, his daughters were to have half as much estate as his sons, and he mentions that Lucy and Elizabeth had already been portioned with farms. The above sketch of his landed property comprises only that which remained inviolate as it passed through the hands of his sons, and his grandson John, the son of Wait, and was bequeathed by the latter to his son, John, John Still Winthrop, Still Winthrop, in 1747.¹

April 11th, 1678. At this date was exhibited in town meeting a list of the *proper*, or accepted inhabitants of the town, and their names registered. The list comprises 104 names. Only householders or heads of families are supposed to be included. The number of freemen that had been recorded at this time was forty-five, and only twenty more are added before 1700.

On the last Thursday, in Feb., 1677-8, a town meeting was held to deliberate respecting a new meeting-house. The old, or Blinman house, had stood twenty or twenty-five years; it was not only decaying, but the town had outgrown its dimensions. It was resolved to build a new one by the side of the old, the latter to be kept for use until the other should be completed. The building committee were Capt. Avery, Charles Hill and Thomas Beeby, who procured the timber and made preparations to build. But now a strong party appeared in favor of an entirely new site—viz., the corner of an unimproved lot that had been reserved for the ministry.²

1 The will enumerating these possessions, is on record in New London.

2 On Hempstead Street at the south-west corner of Broad Street, just where the Edgecombe house now stands.

A vote was obtained to build upon this spot, but the dissatisfaction was so great, especially among the people east of the river, that a meeting to reconsider the subject was called April 19th, 1679, which passed the following conciliatory resolution.

"The town sees cause, for the avoiding of future animosities, and for satisfaction of our loving neighbors on the east side of the river to condescend that the new meeting-house shall be built near the old, Mr. Bradstreet having spared part of his lot to be made him good on the other side, for the accommodation of this work; but that the vote above [i. e., before taken] was and is, good in law, and irrevocable, but by the loving consent of neighbors is altered, which shall be no precedent for future altering any town vote."

The second or Bradstreet meeting-house, was therefore built near the old one, on the south-west corner of what was called the meeting-house green (now Town Square.) It is not strange that the inhabitants east of the river should have murmured at any aggravation of their Sabbath-day journeys, which at the best, were of a wearisome length, crossing the river and ascending from the ferry stairs to the town street, and from thence up the hill through the present Richards Street to the place of worship. We are disposed to ask, why under such circumstances the house was built on a hill at all? why not on a level near the water's edge? The answer is ready—the early church of New England was not only a church, but a tower, and a beacon: its turret must serve as a look-out post, affording timely notice should any danger threaten the dwellings of those who were engaged in the service of the sanctuary. Moreover, the people of New England seem to have had a natural taste for a church set on a hill. It was to them the position of beauty, propriety, and adaptation.

The contract for building the meeting-house was made with John Elderkin and Samuel Lothrop. It was to be forty feet square; the studs twenty feet high with a turret answerable; two galleries, fourteen windows, three doors; and to set up on all the four gables of the house, pyramids comely and fit for the work, and as many lights in each window as direction should be given: a year and a half allowed for its completion: £240 to be paid in provision, viz., in wheat, pease, pork and beef, in quantity proportional: the town to find nails, glass, iron-work, and ropes for rearing; also to boat and cart the timber to the place and provide sufficient help to rear the work.

This meeting-house, instead of being completed as the contract specifies, in October, 1680, lingered several years in the road to completion. Repeated orders were enacted concerning it; the pulpit

from the old house was removed to it; the carpenters were accused of violating their contract, and the work not satisfying the committee, two of the craft from other towns—John Frink, of Stonington, and Edward DeWolf, of Lyme—were called in to view the work, and arbitrate between builders and people. Sept. 6th, 1682, the town came to this emphatic decision :

“ Voted : that the meeting-house shall be completed and finished to worship God in ; according to conformity of duty of Church and Town, and Town and Church.”

The old Blinman edifice—the unadorned church and watch-tower of the wilderness—decayed and dismantled, was sold to Capt. Avery, in June, 1684, for £6, with the condition annexed, that he should remove it in one month’s time. According to tradition, he took it down and transporting the materials across the river used them in building his own house at Pequonuck. Retaining through this process something of its sacred predilections, it was again used as a house of worship about a century after its removal, by Elder Parke Avery, a leader of the separatists. The same timbers, the same boards, joyfully resounded once more to the ancient but well remembered voices of exhortation and praise. This house is still extant, and with its later but yet antique additions, and its charming situation, exhibits one of the most interesting and picturesque farm-houses in the county.

While the meeting-house was building the parsonage was to be repaired. This, though called a parsonage and the town house, and kept in repair by the town, had been given to Mr. Bradstreet and was his property in fee-simple. It stood on the south side of the present Town Square.

“ March 22d, 1680-1.

“ Voted, that Mr. Thomas Parkes, Senior, hath given him one hundred acres of land in one entire piece adjoining his own land, in consideration of providing good cedar clapboards, for the parsonage house, and nails and workmanship and all other charge about the same, to be finished by the last of August next ensuing.”

In 1680, Mr. Bradstreet’s health began to decline. In August, 1681, being no longer able to preach, he proposed to the town to resign his charge, but the people requested him to remain with them adding :

“ The town is willing to allow him a comfortable maintenance as God shall enable them, and they will wait God’s providence in respect of his health.

"Voted, to allow him £120 a year in provision pay, and also to find him his fire-wood, ninety loads for the ensuing year."

The baptism of a child is recorded August 12th, 1683, in Mr. Bradstreet's hand: this is the last token of him living. On the 19th of November, a rate was voted to pay Mrs. Bradstreet the arrears due to her deceased husband. His death is not registered, neither is there any memorial stone bearing his name in the burial-ground.

Rev. Simon Bradstreet was the oldest son of Hon. Simon Bradstreet who was governor of Mass. from May, 1679, to May, 1692, with the exception of two years, '87, and '88, which belong to the iron rule of Sir Edmund Andross. The son died at the age of forty-five, while the father, though venerable in age, was in the mid career of usefulness.¹ The mother of Rev. Simon Bradstreet was Ann, d. of Gov. Thomas Dudley. He was born in 1638; grad. at H. C. in 1660; began to preach in N. L. in 1666; was ordained in 1670 and died in 1683.

"Children of Simon Bradstreet and his wife Lucy.

"Simon b. 7. March 1670-1, baptized 12. March.

"Anne b. 31. Dec. 1672, bap. 5. Jan. 1672-3, died 2. Oct. 1681.

"John b. 3. Nov. 1676, bap. 5. Nov.

"Lucy b. 24. Oct. 1680, bap. 31. Oct."

Mrs. Lucy, relict of Rev. Simon Bradstreet, afterward married Daniel Epes, of Ipswich, whom she likewise survived. In 1697, the Bradstreet house-lot in New London, was sold to Nicholas Hallam, and the deed of sale signed by Mrs. Epes and her oldest son, "Symon Bradstreet of Medford, clerk."²

It has been mentioned that the church at Mr. Bradstreet's ordination, in 1670, consisted of twenty-four members. During his ministry forty-four were added, four only by dismission from other churches.

"Mrs. Aun Latimer from the old church at Boston.

"Widow Lester from the church at Concord.

"Old Goodman Moore and his wife from the ch. at Milford."

Mr. Bradstreet's record of baptisms comprises seventeen belonging to other churches, and 438 of his own church: of these last a considerable number were adults; some parents being baptized them-

¹ Gov. Bradstreet died in Salem March 27th, 1697, at the age of ninety-four.

² This younger Simon Bradstreet, a native of New London, was afterward minister of Charlestown, Mass., and a man of great classical attainments, but of an infirm constitution and desponding temperament. His son of the same name, the fourth that had borne it in lineal succession, was ordained at Marblehead, January 4th, 1738. (Mass. Hist. Coll., 1st series, Vol. 8, p. 76.)

selves, at the time that they owned the covenant, and presented their children for baptism.

Baptisms followed close upon births; numerous instances may be found where the child was but one, two or three days old; children of ministers, deacons, &c., were usually less than a week old. To renew, or own the covenant of baptism, entitled a parent to the privilege of presenting his or her children for baptism. And not only children, but grandchildren, children bound to the person as apprentices, and slaves, might be presented by giving a pledge for their Christian education.

There is no account of any marriage performed by Mr. Bradstreet. Throughout all New England, previous to 1680, the marriage rite was performed by magistrates, or by persons specially empowered by the colonial authorities. Hutchinson supposes that in Massachusetts there was no instance of a marriage by a clergyman during the existence of their first charter—that is, previous to 1684.¹ It is singular, that in a country and at a period of time when the clergy were so much venerated, the privilege of solemnizing the marriage contract should not have been assigned to them. When also the importance of the act is considered, the sacredness of its associations, and the propriety of regarding it as a holy rite, we are surprised that our devout ancestors should not have connected the sanctions of religion with this most important of their social compacts. Yet even when a clergyman was present, the ordinance was made valid by a magistrate.

The first marriages in town were by Mr. Winthrop: none of these are recorded. Wm. Chesebrough, Capt. George Denison and Mr. Bruen officiated in these services being commissioners; but by far the greater number of marriages between 1670 and 1700 were by Daniel Wetherell, Esq.

The appointment of deacons is not registered. William Douglas, may have been the first person that held the office after Mr. Bradstreet's ordination. He was at least active in the church economy, and held the box at the door for contributions. He died in 1682. In 1683, William Hough and Joseph Coite were deacons; the former died August 10th, of that year, before Mr. Bradstreet's decease,

¹ "All marriages in New England were formerly performed by the civil magistrate, but of late they are more frequently solemnized by the clergy." Neal's New England, vol. 2, p. 253.

and no other deacon except Coite, is mentioned during the next ten years.

"At a Towne meeting November ye 19, 1683.

"Voted that Major John Winthrop, Major Edward Palmes, Capt. James Avery, Mr. Daniel Wetherell, Mr. Christo. Christophers, Tho: Beebe, Joseph Coite, John Prentis Sen^r, Clement Miner, Charles Hill, are appointed a Committee in behalf of the town to send a letter by Capt. Wayte Winthrop to the reverend Mr. Mather and Mr. Woppard [Willard] ministers at boston for there advice and counsell in attayneing a minister for the town to supply the place of Mr. Bradstreet deceased, and that the sd Capt. Winthrop shall have instructions from the sd Committee to manadge that affaire wth them."

No minister was obtained until the next June, when the committee gave notice that they had applied to Mr. Edward Oakes, of Cambridge, and received a favorable answer. The town declared their approbation, and voted Mr. Oakes a salary equal to £100 *per annum*, for so long a time as he and they could agree together.

Mr. Oakes is presumed to be the Edward Oakes that graduated at Cambridge, in the class of 1679. He preached in New London about a year, and some preparatory steps to a settlement were taken. But the inhabitants were not unanimous in his favor, and he left the place.¹ In September, 1685, the committee of supply obtained the services of Mr. Thomas Barnet, who arrived in town soon afterward with his family, and entered upon the duties of a pastor. These he performed to such entire satisfaction, that in November a vote was passed by the town in acceptance of his ministry. Again, Dec. 26th,

"Mr. Thomas Barnett by full consent none contradicting was accepted by the inhabitants to be their minister." "Major John Winthrop is chosen to appear as the mouth of the Town to declare their acceptance of Mr. Barnett." "The time for ye solemnity of Mr. Barnetts admittance to all ministerial offices is left to the direction of Mr. Barnett and the townsmen to appoint the day."

It is a fact, but an unaccountable one, that after this date, Mr. Barnett's name disappears from the records. No hint has been found to explain why the arrangement with him failed, and the connection was dissolved. He is never again mentioned except in the town accounts, where Jonathan Prentis exhibits a debt of 16s. "for going with Mr. Barnet to Swansea."

Mr. Barnett was an English clergyman, ejected from his living for non-conformity, and driven from England by the rigorous church

¹ Farmer, in his Genealogical Register, says he died young. His decease, therefore, probably took place soon after leaving New London.

measures which followed the restoration of the house of Stuart to the throne,¹ that is, after 1662. His history after leaving New London, has not been traced.²

On the 22d of June, 1687, the inhabitants were again assembled in solemn deliberation upon that oft recurring and momentous question—What are “the best ways and means for procuring an able minister of the gospel?” A committee of seven, with Colonel John Winthrop at the head, was appointed to act for the town, which after a few months’ delay was so fortunate as to secure the services of the Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall. He preached during the winter and in a short time engaged all hearts and votes in his favor. In May, 1688, the inhabitants passed a unanimous vote of acceptance of his ministry, requesting his continuance among them, promising to give him due encouragement, and adding, “on his return from Boston, whether he is shortly going, they will proceed to have him ordained.” The ordination, however, did not take place, though the cause of delay is not mentioned. Another vote of acceptance was passed the 7th of June, 1689.

In the mean time an attempt was made, as had been done once before, to dispense with the odious system of minister’s rates, and to raise the salary by voluntary subscriptions of an annual sum. A paper was accordingly circulated, a copy of which is extant. The number of subscribers is 105, embracing names that were scattered over the township from Nahantic Bay to Mystic, and from Poquetannuck to the Sound. The amount pledged was £57, which being insufficient, the project failed, and the rates continued to be levied as formerly.

In 1690, a rate was levied for the purpose of finishing the interior of the meeting-house, which to this time had not been furnished with regular seats. This being completed, the townsmen, with the assistance of Ensign Clement Minor and Sergeant Thomas Beeby, assigned seats to the inhabitants. This was always an affair of magnitude, and the town had frequently been obliged to interfere to adjust doubtful cases of precedence and compel satisfaction. At this time only one case is reported for their decision.

“Joseph Beckwith having paid 40s. towards finishing the meeting-house, is

¹ Mather’s *Magnalia*, vol. 1, p. 216, (Hartford edition.)

² Perhaps he was unexpectedly recalled to England. This would account for his sudden departure from New London.

allowed a seat in the 4th seat, and his wife also in the 4th seat, on the woman's side."

These proceedings in regard to the meeting-house were tokens fore-showing that the ordination was at hand. At a town meeting on the 25th of August, 1691—"number of persons present, heads of families, 65"—the votes of 1688 and 1689 respecting the acceptance of Mr. Saltonstall for the ministry, were read and confirmed, and the townsmen empowered to make arrangements with him for his ordination.

"Voted that the Hon^{le} Major General John Winthrop is to appear as the mouth of the Town at Mr. Saltonstall's ordination, to declare the town's acceptance of him to the ministry."

The solemnity took place November 25th, 1691.

The assisting ministers were Mr. Elliot and Mr. Woodbridge, probable Rev. Joseph Elliot, of Guilford, and Rev. Timothy Woodbridge, of Hartford. No additions to the church and no baptisms had been recorded since Mr. Bradstreet's death, that is, between August, 1683, and November, 1691. Previous to his ordination (November 19th) Mr. Saltonstall was received as a member of the church. This was then the customary mode of proceeding. It appears to have been regarded as requisite, and a matter of course, that a minister should belong to the church over which he officiated. The number of members enrolled was thirty-five.

To signalize the entrance of Mr. Saltonstall on his official duties, a bell was procured, "a large brass bell," the first in the town and in New London county. It cost £25 in current money,¹ and for ringing it, William Chapman, sexton, was to have forty shillings added to his annual salary of £3. It may be inferred from the boisterous reputation of the town, that this bell met with no very gentle usage, and that it poured forth some lively explosions of alarm or triumph, from its elevated post, before it was involved in the destruction of the building to which it was attached.

Mr. Saltonstall, assisted by a gratuity from the town, purchased a lot, and built a house for himself. This lot was in the upper part of the town, on both sides of the street. The house stood high and conspicuous on the town hill,² and for his accommodation the Codner

¹ The receipt for payment is from "Richard Jones, attorney to George Makeensie, merchant of the City of Yorke."

² On the spot now occupied by the house of Capt. Andrew Mather.

highway, or "old pathway from the meeting-house to the mill," in the rear of his house, which had been shut up, was re-opened and laid out, twenty-five feet wide. This path was then a mere bed of loose stones, and bristling rocks, and such in a great measure it still remains,¹ being better known as Stony-Hill Lane, than as Huntington Street, of which it forms the north end. By a gate from the orchard in the rear of his house, Mr. Saltonstall was brought within a few rods of the church, and the worst part of the declivity, in ascending to the house of worship, was avoided.

At a later period, when Mr. Saltonstall had become governor of the colony, it is retained by tradition, that he might be seen on a Sunday morning, issuing from this orchard gate, and moving with a slow, majestic step to the meeting-house, accompanied by his wife, and followed by his children, four sons and four daughters, marshaled in order, and the servants of the family in the rear. The same usage was maintained by his son, General Gurdon Saltonstall, whose family furnished a procession of fourteen sons and daughters, when all were present, which might often have happened between 1758 and 1762, as then all were living, and all of an age to attend meeting.

The summer of 1689 was noted for extreme heat; this was followed by a virulent epidemic, which visited almost every family, either in a qualified or mortal form, and proved fatal in more than twenty cases. Most of these occurred in July and August. Mr. Wetherell, then the recorder, inserted in the town book a list of the dead, under the following caption:

"An account of several persons deceased by the present distemper of sore throat and fever, which distemper hath passed through most families, and proved very mortal with many, especially to those who now have it in this more than ordinary extremity of hot weather, the like having not been known in the memory of man."

Those who perished by this epidemic, above the age of childhood, were Philip Bill, senior; Walter Bodington; Edward Smith and his wife, and their son, John, fifteen years of age; Widow Nicholls, and the wives of Ensign Morgan, Samuel Fox, John Picket, and Mr. Holmes. About the same period, Christopher Jeffers, a ferryman, was drowned, and Abel Moore, the constable, died on the road, as he was returning from a journey to Boston, and was buried at Dedham.

A disease so malignant would naturally cast a pall of gloom over a

¹ Its condition has been greatly ameliorated the present year, 1852.

population so sparse and intimately connected. At the same time the whole country was full of anxiety and apprehension in regard to their liberties. No direct allusion is made in the records of the town to the baneful transit of Sir Edmund Andros, athwart the prosperity of New England. His administration caused a general interruption of the laws of the colony for eighteen months. He assumed the government and abrogated the charter at Hartford, October 31st, 1687. One of his regulations was that no town meetings should be held except once a year, in the month of May, for the choice of town officers. Agreeably to this law, the annual town meeting was held in New London, May 21st, and no other is recorded until after the fall of the royal delegate. On the 18th of April, 1689, the inhabitants of Boston rose in arms, seized and imprisoned Andros, and persuaded the old governor and council to resume the government. This example was followed by Connecticut. The General Court was speedily assembled, and an order restoring the former laws was published on the 9th of May. The charter now came out from its thick-ribbed hiding-place in the renowned oak, and re-assumed its former supremacy. The court order was enrolled and published at New London, and the annual meeting for the choice of town officers called on the 7th of June. In point of fact it was convened by officers whose authority had expired on the 21st of May, and the minutes of the meeting say:

"Upon some dispute that happened whether this town meeting was Legally warned, it was put to voate, and by a Generall Voate passed to be Legall, and then proceeded to Choice of Towne officers."

This was a summary mode of deciding a question of law, but it satisfied the majority, and the decision was not afterward disturbed.

"11. July 1694.

"Voted that a new meeting-house shall be forthwith built, and that a rate of 12 pence on the pound be made for it. Capt. Wetherell, Mr. Pygan, Capt. James Morgan, Lt. James Avery, Mr. John Davie, Sergt Nehemiah Smith, Ensign John Hough, and Richard Christophers, are chosen a committee to agree with workmen for building the house, and managing the whole conern about it."

The regular registry of the town leaves us wholly in the dark as to the cause of this sudden movement in respect to a meeting-house; but from incidental testimony it is ascertained that the Bradstreet meeting-house was destroyed by fire, probably in June of this year. It was supposed to be an act of incendiarism, and public fame attributed it to the followers of John Rogers, a new sect that had lately

arisen in the town, of which an account will be given in a future chapter. Several of these people were arrested and tried for the crime, but it could not be proved against them, and they may now without hesitation be pronounced innocent. For they were at that time obnoxious to the community ; public sentiment was enlisted on the other side, and had they committed a deed which was then esteemed a high degree of sacrilege, it is difficult to believe that they could have escaped exposure and penalty.

Unwonted energy was displayed in replacing the lost edifice. In four years' time, the third, which we may call the Saltonstall meeting-house, was so far completed as to be used for divine service. It stood on the same height of ground that had been hallowed by its predecessors.

“ July 18, 1698.

“ Voted that the town accepts the gift of the Bell given by Governor Winthrop for the meeting house with great thankfulness and desire that their thanks may be given to his Honor for the same.

“ Voted that the bell be forthwith hanged and placed on the top of the meeting house at charge of the town, the townsmen to procure it to be done.

“ Voted whether the town will finish the meeting house this summer.

“ Voted—that it shall be done.”

The house was soon after finished, and the people seated : liberty was however given to certain individuals to build their own pews, under regulations in respect to “ place and bigness,” and they paying no less in the rates for finishing the house. Lastly, the sexton was appointed.

“ Voted that William Hallys is chosen sexton to sweep and cleane the meeting house every weeke and to open the dores upon all publique meetings and to ring the bell upon the Sabbath day and all other publique days of meeting and also to ring the bell every night at nine of the clock winter and sumer,¹ for which service the towne hath voated to give him five pounds in money and ten shillings yearly.”

How small these arrangements ; how simple such accommodations appear by the side of the costly structures for worship that are now spread over the land. Yet if the glory of the temple depends on the divine presence, upon humble service and fervent aspirations, who will say that the stupendous piles of latter days are more honored than their lowly predecessors !

1 This curfew-bell, with the slight alteration of ringing it at eight o'clock instead of nine, on Saturday night, has been regularly continued down to 1851.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE ROGERS FAMILY, AND THE SECT OF ROGERENES.

THE unity of religious worship in New London, was first interrupted by James Rogers and his sons. A brief account of the family will lead to the history of their religious doctrines.

James Rogers is supposed to be the *James Roger*, who came to America, in the Increase, 1635, aged 20.¹ As *James Rogers*, he is first known to us at Stratford, where he married Elizabeth, daughter of Samuel Rowland,² and is afterward found at Milford, where his wife united with Mr. Prudden's church in 1645, and himself in 1652. Their children were, Samuel, whose birth has not been found on record, but his will, dated Feb. 12th, 1712-13, states his age to be "72 and upwards," which will place it in 1640; Joseph, baptized in Milford, 1646; John, in 1648; Bathsheba, in 1650; James, not recorded, but next in order: Jonathan, born Dec. 31st, 1655; Elizabeth, 1658.

Mr. Rogers had dealings in New London in 1656, and between that time and 1660, fixed himself permanently in the plantation. Here he soon acquired property and influence, and was much employed both in civil and ecclesiastical affairs. He was six times representative to the General Court. Mr. Winthrop had encouraged his settlement in the place, and had accommodated him with a portion of his own house lot, next the mill, on which Rogers built a dwelling-house of stone.³ He was a baker on a large scale, often furnishing biscuit for seamen, and for colonial troops, and between 1660 and

¹ Gleanings. Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 8, p. 161.

² Samuel Rowland left his farm to Samuel Rogers, his grandson, which leads to the supposition that Elizabeth was his only child.

³ This spot was afterward re-purchased by the Winthrop family, and was the site of the house built by John Still Winthrop, and now owned by C. A. Lewis, Esq.

1670 had a greater interest in the trade of the port than any other person in the place. His landed possessions were very extensive, consisting of several hundred acres on the Great Neck, the fine tract of land at Mohegan called the Pamechaug farm, several house-lots in town, and twenty-four hundred acres east of the river, which he held in partnership with Col. Pyncheon, of Springfield.

Perhaps no one of the early settlers of New London, numbers at the present day so great a throng of descendants as James Rogers. His five sons are the progenitors of as many distinct lines, each tracing to its immediate founder, and seldom cognizant of their common ancestor. His daughters were women of great energy of character. Elizabeth married Samuel Beeby; Bathsheba married first Richard Smith, and second Samuel Fox. She was an early seceder from the church; courting persecution and much persecuted.

Samuel Rogers married, Nov. 17th, 1664, Mary, daughter of Thomas Stanton; the parents of the two parties, entering into a formal contract, and each pledging £200 as a marriage portion to the couple. Mr. Rogers, in fulfillment of his bond, conveyed to his son his stone house and bakery, at the head of Winthrop's (or Mill) Cove, where the latter commenced his housekeeping and dwelt for fifteen or twenty years. He then removed to the out-lands of the town, near the Mohegan tribe, and became the first English settler within the limits of the present town of Montville.

Joseph, James and Jonathan Rogers, though living at first in the town plot, removed to farms upon the Great Neck, given them by their father. Like most active men of that time, they had a variety of occupations, each and all operating as tradesmen, mechanics, boatmen, seamen and farmers.

James, the fourth son, married, November 5th, 1674, Mary, daughter of Jeffrey Jordan, of Ireland. According to tradition, he commanded a vessel which brought over from Ireland, a number of redemptioners, and among them a family of the name of Jordan. On their arrival he became the purchaser of the oldest daughter, Mary, and married her. In after life he was accustomed to say, sportively, that it was the richest cargo he ever shipped, and the best bargain he ever made. Several of his descendants of the same name in a right line, were sea-captains.

John Rogers, the third son of James, having become conspicuous as the founder of a sect, which, though small in point of numbers, has been of considerably local notoriety, requires a more extended notice. No man in New London county was at one time more no-

ted than he ; no one suffered so heavily from the arm of the law, the tongue of rumor, and the pen of contemporary writers. His followers still exist, a handful indeed, but yet a distinct people, venerating the name of their founder, and esteeming him a man eminent for piety and filled with the love of God and his neighbor. His opponents, on the other hand, have left us an image of the man that excites not only indignation and pity, but profound disgust. Ample materials exist on both sides for his history, but the two faces of Janus could not be more unlike. Rogers himself produced tracts and treatises in abundance, which often refer to his own experience ; and his followers have been, to a considerable degree, a print-loving people. His son, John Rogers the second, was a ready writer. John Bolles, a noted disciple, was fluent with the pen, and adroit in argument ; and the family of Watrous, the more recent leaders of the sect, have issued various pamphlets, to vindicate their course and record their sufferings. This is not therefore a one-sided case, in which the arraigned have had no one to speak for them. It may be said, however, with truth, that the accounts on one side have been but little consulted, and that the statements which have had the widest circulation, come from the opponents of the Rogerenes. This may be regarded as a sufficient reason for entering more at large upon their origin and history.

John Rogers was married, Oct. 17th, 1670, at Black Hall, in Lyme, to Elizabeth, daughter of Matthew Griswold. The rite was performed by the father of the bride, and accompanied with the formality of a written contract and dowry ; the husband setting his farm at Upper Mamacock, on the wife, in case of his death, or separation from her, during her life. On this farm, two miles north of New London, after their marriage, they dwelt, and had two children :

Elizabeth, born Nov. 8th, 1671.

John, born March 20th, 1674.

James Rogers and his wife and children, and those connected with the latter as partners in marriage, with the exception of Samuel Rogers and wife, all became dissenters in some sort from the established Congregational church, which was then the only one recognized by the laws of the land. The origin of this dissent may be traced to an intercourse which began in the way of trade, with the Sabbatarians, or Seventh-day Baptists of Rhode Island. John and James Rogers, Jun., first embraced the Sabbatarian principles, and were baptized in 1674 ; Jonathan, in 1675 ; James Rogers, Sen.,

with his wife and daughter Bathsheba, in 1676, and these were received as members of the Seventh-day church at Newport. Jonathan Rogers still further cemented his union with the Seventh-day community, by marriage with Naomi Burdick, a daughter of one of the elders of the church. Of the baptism of Joseph Rogers we have no account. His wife went down into the water on Sunday, Nov. 24th, 1677, near the house of Samuel Rogers, at the head of Winthrop's Cove. Elders Hubbard and Hiscox, from Rhode Island, were present, and it was expected that one of them would perform the rite; but the town authorities having interfered and requested them to do it elsewhere, on account of the noise and tumult that might ensue, they acquiesced in the reasonableness of the proposal, and declined acting on the occasion. But John Rogers would assent to no compromise, and assuming on the spot the authority of an elder, and the responsibility of the act, he led the candidate into the water, and performed the baptism.¹

From this time forth, John Rogers began to draw off from the Sabbatarians, and to broach certain peculiar notions of his own. He assumed the ministerial offices of baptizing and preaching, and having gained a few disciples, originated a new sect, forming a church or society, which were called Rogerenes, or Rogerene Quakers, and sometimes Rogerene Baptists.

A great and predominant trait of the founder of the sect, and of his immediate followers, was their determination to be persecuted. They were aggressive, and never better pleased than when by shaking the pillars, they had brought down the edifice upon their own heads. They esteemed it a matter of duty, not only to suffer fines, distraintment, degradation, imprisonment and felonious penalties with patience, but to obtrude themselves upon the law, and challenge its power, and in fact to persecute others, by interrupting their worship, and vehemently denouncing what they esteemed sacred. This point the followers of Rogers have abrogated. At the present day they never molest the worship of others, and are themselves unmolested.

In respect to the most important articles of Christianity, Rogers was strenuously orthodox. He held to salvation by faith in Christ, the Trinity, the new birth, the resurrection of the just and unjust, and an eternal judgment. He maintained also obedience to the civil government, except in matters of conscience and religion. A town or

¹ A more particular account of this affair may be found in Backus' Church History and in Benedict's History of the Baptists, vol. 2, p. 422.

country rate the Rogerenes always considered themselves bound to pay, but the minister's rate they abhorred—denouncing as unscriptural all interference of the civil power in the worship of God. Of their peculiar characteristics a brief summary must here suffice.

In respect to baptism, and the rejection of the first day Sabbath, they agree with the Sabbatarians, but they diverge from them on other points. They consider all days alike in respect to sanctity, and though they meet for religious purposes on the first day of the week, when the exercise is over, they regard themselves as free to labor as on any other day. They have no houses set apart for public worship, and regard a steeple, a pulpit, a cushion, a church, and a salaried minister in a black suit of clothes, as utter abominations. They hold that a public oath is like any other swearing, a profanation of the Holy Name, and plainly forbidden in Scripture. They make no prayers in public worship or in the family: John Rogers conceived that all prayers should be mental and not vocal, except on special occasions when the Spirit of God moving within, prompted the use of the voice. They use no means for the recovery of health, except care, kindness and attention, considering all resort to drugs, medicines and physicians, as sinful.

The entire rejection of the Sabbath, and of a resident ministry, were opinions exceedingly repugnant to the community at large, and were rendered more so by the violent and obtrusive manner in which they were propagated. Their author went boldly forth, exhorting and testifying in streets, disturbing public worship, and courting persecution with an eagerness that seemed akin to an aspiration after martyrdom. His creed was also exceedingly distasteful to the regular Seventh-day people. It was probably in opposition to them, that having his choice of days, as regarding them equal in point of sanctity, he held his meetings for religious purposes on the first rather than on the seventh day.

In 1676, the fines and imprisonments of James Rogers and his sons, for profanation of the Sabbath, commenced. For this, and for neglect of worship, they and some of their followers were usually arraigned at every session of court, for a long course of years. The fine was at first five shillings, then ten shillings, then fifteen shillings. At the June court in 1677, the following persons were arraigned, and each fined £5.

James Rogers, senior, for high-handed, presumptuous profanation of the Sabbath, by attending to his work; Elizabeth Rogers, his wife, and James and Jonathan Rogers, for the same.

John Rogers, on examination, said he had been hard at work making shoes on the first day of the week, and he would have done the same had the shop stood under the window of Mr. Wetherell's house ; yea, under the window of the meeting-house.

Bathshua Smith, for fixing a scandalous paper on the meeting-house.

Mary, wife of James Rogers, junior, for absence from public worship.

Again in September, 1677, the court ordered that John Rogers should be called to account once a month, and fined £5 each time ; others of the family were amerced to the same amount for blasphemy against the Sabbath, calling it an idol, and for stigmatizing the reverend ministers as hirelings. After this, sitting in the stocks and whipping were added.

In May, 1678, (says Backus,) Joseph Clarke wrote to his father Hubbard, from Westerly, that John and James Rogers, with their father, were in prison ; having previously excommunicated Jonathan, chiefly because he did not retain their judgment of the unlawfulness of using medicine, nor accuse himself before authority of working on the first day of the week.

Jonathan Rogers now stood alone among the brothers, adhering steadfastly to the Sabbatarian principles, from which he never swerved. His family became the nucleus of a small society of this denomination on the Great Neck, which has ever since existed. From generation to generation they connected themselves with churches of their own faith in Rhode Island, at first with that of Newport, and afterward with that of Hopkinton and Westerly, until in the year 1784, 109 years after the baptism of their founder, Jonathan Rogers, they were organized into a distinct church and society. A further account of the Seventh-day community on the Neck will be given in the sequel of our history.

In 1680, the magistrates of Connecticut, giving an account of the colony to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, say :

“ Our people in this colony, are some strict Congregational men, others more large Congregational men, and some moderate Presbyterians, &c.—there are four or six seventh-day men, and about so many more Quakers.”¹

These Quakers and Seventh-day men were probably all in New London, and nearly all in the Rogers family. The elder James

¹ Hinman's Antiquities, p. 142.

Rogers was an upright, circumspect man. There is no account of any dealings with him and his wife on account of their secession from Mr. Bradstreet's church. No vote of expulsion or censure is recorded. Of his latter years little is known. Elder Hubbard, of Newport, is quoted by Backus as stating that Mr. Rogers had one of his limbs severely bruised by the wheel of a loaded cart that passed over it, and that he himself saw him when he had remained for six weeks in a most deplorable condition, strenuously refusing the use of means to alleviate his sufferings, but patiently waiting in accordance with his principles, to be relieved by faith. Whether he recovered from this injury or not is unknown. His death occurred in February, 1687-8, when the government of Sir Edmund Andross was paramount in New England. His will was therefore proved in Boston. The first settlement of the estate was entirely harmonious. The children in accordance with the earnest request of their father, made an amicable division of the estate, which was sanctioned by the General Court, May 12th, 1692.

The original will of Mr. Rogers is on file in the probate office of New London. It is in the handwriting of his son John, and remarkable for the simple solemnity of its preamble.

"The Last Will and Testament of James Rogers, Sen', being in perfect memory and understanding but under the hand of God by sickness:—this I leave with my wife and children, sons and daughters, I being old and knowing that the time of my departure is at hand.

"What I have of this world I leave among you, desiring you not to fall out or contend about it; but let your love one to another appear more than to the estate I leave with you, which is but of this world.

"And for your comfort I signify to you that I have a perfect assurance of an interest in Jesus Christ and an eternal happy state in the world to come, and do know and see that my name is written in the book of life, and therefore mourn not for me, as they that are without hope."

In a subsequent part of the document he says:

"If any difference should arise, &c., my will is, that there shall be no lawing among my children before earthly judges, but that the controversy be ended by lot, and so I refer to the judgment of God, and as the lot comes forth, so shall it be."

In this respect unfortunately the will of the father was never accomplished: his children, notwithstanding their first pacific arrangement, engaged afterward in long and acrimonious contention, respecting boundaries, in the course of which earthly judges were often obliged to interfere and enforce a settlement.

Soon after John Rogers connected himself with the Sabbatarians, his wife left him and returned to her father. In May, 1675, she applied to the legislature for a divorce, grounding her plea not only upon the heterodoxy of her husband, but upon certain alleged immoralities. The court, after the delay of nearly a year and a half, granted her petition.

At a session of the General Court, held at Hartford, October 12th, 1676 :

"The Court having considered the petition of Elizabeth Rogers, the wife of John Rogers, for a release from her conjugal bond to her husband, with all the allegations and proofs presented, to clear the righteousness of her desires, do find just cause to grant her desire, and do free her from her conjugal bond to the said John Rogers."

By a subsequent act of Assembly, (October, 1677,) she was allowed to retain her two children wholly under her own charge; the court giving as a reason the heterodoxy of Rogers, both in opinion and practice, he having declared in open court that he utterly renounced the visible worship of New England, and regarded the Christian Sabbath as a mere invention.

Rogers was incensed at these decisions of the court. The bill of divorce did not specify any offense on his part, as the base upon which it was granted, and he ever afterward maintained that they had taken away his wife without rendering to him, or to the public, any reason why they had done it. He seems to have long cherished the hope that she would repent of her desertion, and return to him; but in less than two years she married again.

"Peter Pratt was married unto Elisabeth Griswold, that was divorced from John Rogers, 5th of August, 1679 "¹

The children of Rogers remained with their mother during their childhood, but both when they became old enough to act for themselves, preferred to live with their father. Elizabeth was sent to him by her mother, of her own free will, when she was about fourteen years of age, and resided with him till 1689 or 1690, when she was married to Stephen Prentis, of Bruen's Neck. At her wedding, her brother John, then about fifteen years of age, came also to his father, by permission of his mother, to stay as long as he pleased. She afterward sent a constable forcibly to reclaim him, and he was seized and carried back to Lyme; yet he soon returned to his father, embraced

¹ Recorded in Lyme.

his doctrines,¹ and pursued a similar course of itinerant testimony against the public worship of the land.

An agreement was signed in 1687, by which Elizabeth, daughter of Matthew Griswold, senior, engages to relinquish all claim to the Mamacock farm, "provided John Rogers will pay her £30 and never trouble her father about the farm again." By this arrangement the farm reverted to Rogers, and his son, John Rogers, junior, marrying his cousin, Bathsheba Smith, settled at Mamacock. There, notwithstanding his long testimony and his many weary trials and imprisonments, he reared to maturity a family of eighteen children, most of them like their parents, sturdy Rogerenes.² Mamacock, and the neighboring highland over which they spread, has ever since been known as Quaker Hill.

Peter Pratt, the second husband of Elizabeth Griswold, died March 24th, 1688. Shortly afterward she contracted a third marriage with Matthew Beckwith, 2d.³ By the second marriage with Mr. Pratt, she had a son, Peter, who while a young man, studying for the profession of the law, in New London, very naturally renewed his youthful intimacy with his half-brother, John Rogers, junior, of Mamacock. This brought him often into the company of the elder Rogers, to whose exhortations he listened complacently, till at length embracing his dogmas and becoming his disciple, he received baptism at his hands, and endured fines, imprisonment and public abuse, on account of his Quakerism. But after a time, leaving New London, and entering upon other associations, he relinquished the Rogerene cause, and made a public acknowledgment that he had labored under a delusion. Still further to manifest the sincerity of his recantation, he wrote an account of his lapse and recovery, entitled :

"The Prey taken from the Strong, or an Historical Account of the Recovery of one from the dangerous errors of Quakerism."

In this narrative, Rogers is drawn, not only as an obstinate, heterodox enthusiast, but many revolting circumstances are added, which would justify the greatest odium ever cast upon him. It was not published till 1724, three years after the death of Rogers. He could not therefore answer for himself, but the indignation of the son was

¹ In the phraseology of the sect, he *disciplined in with him immediately*.

² John Rogers, 2d, by his two wives had twenty children: two died in infancy.

³ By this third marriage she had one daughter, Griswold Beckwith, afterward the wife of Eliakim Cooley, junior, of Springfield.

roused, and in defense of his father, he entered into controversy with his brother, and published a rejoinder, from which portions of the preceding narrative have been taken. He meets the charges against the moral and domestic character of his father, with a bold denial of their truth ; but his erratic course in matters of faith and religious practice, he makes no attempt to palliate, these being points in which he himself, and the whole sect, gloried. He denies, however, that his father was properly classed among Quakers, observing :

" In his lifetime he was the only man in Conn. colony, I have ever heard of, that did publicly in print oppose the Quakers in those main principles wherein they differ from other sects."

But the term Quaker had been firmly fixed upon them by their opponents, and they were customarily confounded with the Ranters, or Ranting Quakers, known in the early days of the colony. Yet they never came under the severe excision of the law enacted against those people in 1656 and 1658 ; that is, they were never forcibly transported out of the colony, nor were others prohibited from intercourse with them. Yet John Rogers states that under the provisions of this law, his books were condemned and burnt as heretical. The law itself was disallowed and made void by an act of the Queen in Council, October 11th, 1705. There were other laws, however, by which the Rogerenes were convicted. By the early code of Connecticut, absence from public worship was to be visited by a penalty of five shillings ; labor on the Sabbath, twenty shillings ; and the performance of church ordinances by any other person than an approved minister of the colony, or an attendance thereupon, £5.

Though in most of the cases of arrest and punishment, the Rogerenes were the aggressors, and drew down the arm of the law on their own heads, it must be acknowledged that they encountered a vigorous and determined opposition. Offense was promptly met by penalty. Attempts were made to weary them out, and break them up by a series of fines, imposed upon presentments of the grand jury. These fines were many times repeated, and the estates of the offenders melted under the seizures of the constable, as snow melts before the sun. The course was a cruel one, and by no means popular. At length the magistrates could scarcely find an officer willing to perform the irksome task of distraining. And it is probable that all penalties would have been silently dropped, had they not kept up the aggressive system of testifying, as it was called ; that is, presenting themselves in the religious assemblies of their neighbors, to utter

their testimony against the worship. In this line, John Rogers, and the elder sister, were the principal offenders; often carrying their work into meeting, and interrupting the service with exclamations and protests against what was said or done.

The records of the county court abound with instances to verify these statements. Only a sample will be given:

"April 14th, 1685. Judges upon the bench, Fitch, Avery and Wetherell. John Rogers, James Rogers, Jr., Samuel Beebee, Jr., and Joanna Way, are complained of for profaning God's holy day by servile work, and are grown to that height of impiety as to come at several times into the town to re-baptize several persons; and when God's people were met together on the Lord's day to worship God, several of them came and made great disturbance, behaving themselves in such a frantic manner as if possessed with a diabolical spirit, so affrighting and amazing that several women swooned and fainted away. John Rogers to be whipped fifteen lashes, and for unlawfully re-baptizing to pay £5. The others to be whipped."

One of the most notorious instances of contempt exhibited by Rogers against the religious worship of his fellow-townsmen, was the sending of a *wig* to a contribution made in aid of the ministry. This was in derision of the full-bottomed wigs then worn by the clergy. It was sent by some one who deposited it in his name in the contribution box that was passed around in meeting. Rogers relished a joke, and was often represented by his opponents as shaking his sides with laughter at the confusion into which they were thrown by his inroads upon them. What course was pursued by the authorities in regard to the wig is not known, but the following candid apology is found on the town book, subscribed by the offender's own hand.

"Whereas I John Rogers of New London did rashly and unadvisedly send a perewigg to the contribution of New London, which did reflect dishonor upon that which my neighbours ye inhabitants of New London account the ways and ordinances of God and ministry of the word to the greate offence of them, I doe hereby declare that I am sorry for the sayde action and doe desire all those whom I have offended to accept this my publique acknowledgement as full satisfaction. 27th, 1: 91.¹

JOHN ROGERS."

The regret here expressed must have been but a temporary emotion, as he resumed immediately the same career of offense. In Nov., 1692, besides his customary fines for working on the Sabbath, and for baptizing, he was amerced £4 for entertaining Banks and Case

(itinerant exhorters) for a month or more at his house. In 1693 and 1694, he and others of his family were particularly eager to win the notice of the law. Samuel Fox, presented for catching eels on Sunday, said that he made no difference of days; his wife Bathshua Fox went openly to the meeting-house to proclaim that she had been doing servile work on their Sabbath; John Rogers accompanied her, interrupting the minister, and proclaiming a similar offense. James Rogers and his wife assaulted the constable as he was rolling away a barrel of beef that he had distrained for the minister's rate, threw scalding water upon him, and recaptured the beef.¹

To various offenses of this nature, Rogers added the greater one of trundling a wheelbarrow into the porch of the meeting-house during the time of service; for which after being set in the stocks he was put into prison, and there kept for a considerable time. While thus held in durance, he hung out of the window a board with the following proclamation attached;

“I, John Rogers, a servant of Jesus Christ, doth here make an open declaration of war against the great red dragon, and against the beast to which he gives power; and against the false church that rides upon the beast; and against the false prophets who are established by the dragon and the beast; and also a proclamation of derision against the sword of the devil's spirit, which is prisons, stocks, whips, fines and revilings, all which is to defend the doctrines of devils.”²

On the next Sunday after this writing was hung out, Rogers being allowed the privilege of the prison limits on that day, rushed into the meeting-house during service, and with great noise and vehemence interrupted the minister, and denounced the worship. This led to the issuing of a warrant to remove him to Hartford gaol. The mittimus, dated March 28th, 1694, and signed by James Fitch, assistant, sets forth:

“Whereas John Rodgers of New London hath of late set himself in a furious way in direct opposition to the true worship and pure ordinances, and holy institutions of God, as also on the Lord's Day passing out of prison in the time of public worship, running into the meeting-house in a railing and raging manner, as being guilty of blasphemy,” &c.

1 Records of County Court.

2 Rogers himself in one of his pamphlets gives a copy of this writing. It is also in Benedict's Hist., vol. 2, p. 428.

At Hartford he was tried and fined £5, and required to give a bond of £50 not to disturb the churches hereafter, and seated upon the gallows a quarter of an hour with a halter about his neck. Refusing as usual to pay the fine and give the security, he was remanded to prison and kept there from his first commitment three years and eight months.

During this imprisonment, according to the account of his son, he was treated with great severity, and at one time taken out and cruelly scourged.¹

While Rogers was in prison an attack upon the government and colony appeared, signed by Richard Steer, Samuel Beebe, Jr., Jonathan and James Rogers, accusing them of persecution of dissenters, narrow principles, self-interest, spirit of domineering; and that to compel people to pay for a Presbyterian minister, is against the laws of England, is rapine, robbery and oppression.

A special court was held at New London, Jan. 24th, 1694-5, to consider this libelous paper. The subscribers were fined £5 each, whereupon they appealed to the Court of Assistants at Hartford, which confirming the first decision, they threatened an appeal to *Cesar*, that is to the throne of England. In all probability this was never prosecuted.

Rogers had not been long released from prison before he threw himself into the very jaws of the lion, as it were, by provoking a personal collision with Mr. Saltonstall, the minister of the town.

"At a session of the county court held at New London, Sept. 20th, 1698. Members of the Court, Capt. Daniel Wetherell Esq. and justices William Ely and Nathaniel Lynde. Mr. Gurdon Saltonstall minister of the gospel plf. pr contra John Rogers Sen^r, def^t, in an action of the case for defamation. Whereas you the said John Rogers did sometime in the month of June last past, raise a lying, false and scandalous report against him the said Mr. Gurdon Saltonstall and did publish the same in the hearing of diverse persons, that is to say—did in their hearing openly declare that the said Saltonstall having promised to dispute with you publicly on the holy scriptures did contrary to his said engagement shift or wave the said dispute which he had promised you, which said false report he the said Saltonstall complaineth of as to his great scandall and to his damage unto such value as shall to the said court be made to appear. In this action the jury finds for the plaintiff six hundred pounds, and costs of court, £1, 10."²

It would be wearisome and useless to enumerate all the instances

1 Answer of John Rogers, Jr., to Peter Pratt.

2 County Court Records.

of collision between Rogers and the authorities of the land, which even at this distance of time might be collected. It is stated by his followers that after his conversion he was near one-third of his life-time confined in prisons. "I have," he observes, writing in 1706, "been sentenced to pay hundreds of pounds, laid in iron chains, cruelly scourged; endured long imprisonments, set in the stocks many hours together," &c. John, the younger, states that his father's sufferings continued for more than forty-five years, and adds, "I suppose the like has not been known in the kingdom of England for some ages past."

It was certainly a great error in the early planters of New England to endeavor to produce uniformity in doctrine by the strong arm of physical force. Was ever religious dissent subdued either by petty annoyance or actual cruelty? Is it possible ever to make a true convert by persecution? The principle of toleration was, however, then less clearly understood, and the offenses of the Rogerenes were multiplied and exaggerated both by prejudice and rumor. The crime of blasphemy was one that was often hurled against them. Doubtless a sober mind would not now give so harsh a name, to expressions which our ancestors deemed blasphemous.

In reviewing this controversy we can not avoid acknowledging that there was great blame on both sides, and our sympathies pass alternately from one to the other. The course pursued by the Rogerenes was exceedingly vexatious. The provoking assurance with which they would enter a church, attack a minister, or challenge an argument, is said to have been quite intolerable. Suppose, at the present day, a man like Rogers of a bold spirit, ready tongue, and loud voice, should rise up in a worshiping assembly, and tell the people they were entangled in the net of Antichrist, and sunk deep in the mire of idolatry; then turning to the preacher, call him a hireling shepherd, making merchandise of his flock, and declaring that the rites he administered, viz., baptism by sprinkling—the baptism of infants—and the celebration of the sacrament at any time but at night—were *antichristian fopperies*; accompanying all this with violent contortions, coarse expletives and foaming at the mouth: would it not require great forbearance on the part of the congregation not to call a constable, and forcibly remove the offender? Yet the Rogerenes frequently used more aggressive language than this, and went to greater lengths in their testimony against the *idol Sabbath*. Their own narratives and controversial writings prove this; nor do

they offer any palliation of their course in this respect, but regard it as a duty they must perform, a cross they must bear.

Viewing the established order of the colony, only on the dark and frowning side, they considered it a righteous act to treat it with defiance and aggression. The demands of collectors, the brief of the constable, were ever molesting their habitations. It was now a cow, then a few sheep, the oxen at the plow, the standing corn, the stack of hay, the thrashed wheat, and anon, piece after piece of land, all taken from them to uphold a system which they denounced. Yet our sympathy with these sufferers is unavoidably lessened by the fact, that they courted persecution and gloried in it; often informing against themselves, and compelling the violated law to bring down its arm upon them. Says John Bolles:

“God gave me such a cheerful spirit in this warfare, that when I had not the knowledge that the grand-juryman saw me at work on the first day, I would inform against myself before witness, till they gave out, and let me plow and cart and do whatsoever I have occasion to on this day.”

What should a magistrate do? Often in despite of himself he was forced into severity. He had sworn to enforce the laws; he might shut his eyes and ears and refuse to know that such things were done, but here was a race who would not allow of such connivance; they obtruded their violations of the law upon his notice; and he felt obliged to convict and condemn. The authorities were not in the first place inclined to rigor: they were not a persecuting people. New London county more than any other part of Connecticut, perhaps from its vicinity to Rhode Island, has ever been a stage whereon varied opinions might exhibit themselves freely, and a difference of worship was early tolerated. Governor Saltonstall was perhaps more uniformly rigorous than any other magistrate in repressing the Rogerene disturbances. Nevertheless, while sitting as chief judge of the superior court, he used his utmost endeavors, by argument and conciliation, to persuade them to refrain from molesting the worship of their neighbors.

“He gave his word [says John Bolles] that to persuade us to forbear, if we would be quiet, and worship God in our own way according to our consciences, he would punish any of their people that should disturb us in our worship.”

Here was an opportunity for a compact which might have led to a lasting peace. But the principles of the Rogerenes would not allow of compromise.

It is somewhat singular that in the midst of so much obloquy, John

Rogers should have continued to take part in public affairs. He was never disfranchised; when out of prison he was always ready with his vote; was a warm partisan and frequently chosen to some inferior town office, such as sealer of leather, surveyor of highways, &c. Crimes, such as the code of the present day would define them, were seldom or never proved against the Rogerenes, but it must be allowed that coarseness, vulgarity, and impertinent obtrusiveness, come near to crimes, in the estimation of pure minds.

In the year 1700 Rogers having lived single, from the desertion of his wife twenty-five years, married himself to Mary Ransford. She is said to have been a maid-servant whom he had bought; probably one of that class of persons called Redemptioners. The spirit and temper of this new wife may be inferred from the fact that she had already been arraigned before the court, for throwing scalding water out of the window upon the head of the constable who came to collect the minister's rate. As Rogers would not be married by any minister or magistrate of Connecticut, he was in a dilemma how to have the rite solemnized. His mode of proceeding is thus described by his son :

“They agreed to go into the County Court, and there declare their marriage; and accordingly they did so; he leading his bride by the hand into court, where the judges were sitting, and a multitude of spectators present, and then desired the whole assembly to take notice, that he took that woman to be his wife; his bride also assenting to what he said. Whereupon the judge (Wetherell) offered to marry them in their form, which he refused, telling them that he had once been married by their authority and by their authority they had taken away his wife again, and rendered him no reason why they did it. Upon which account he looked upon their form of marriage to be of no value, and therefore he would be married by their form no more. And from the court he went to the governor's house, (Fitz-John Winthrop's) with his bride and declared their marriage to the governor, who seemed to like it well enough, and wished them much joy, which is the usual compliment.”

This ceremony thus publicly performed, John Rogers, Jr., supposes “every unprejudiced person will judge as authentic as any marriage that was ever made in Connecticut colony.” The authorities did not look upon it in this light. Rogers herein set at defiance the common law, which in matters of civil concernment, his own principles bound him to obey.

A story has been currently reported that this self-married couple presented themselves also before Mr. Saltonstall, the minister, and that he wittily contrived to make the marriage legal, against their will. Assuming an air of doubt and surprise, he says, Do you really,

John, take this your servant-maid, bought with your money, for your wife? Do you, Mary, take this man so much older than yourself for your husband? and receiving from both an affirmative answer, he exclaimed: Then I pronounce you, according to the laws of this colony, man and wife. Upon this Rogers, after a pause, shook his head, and observed, Ah, Gurdon! thou art a cunning creature.

This anecdote, or something like it, may be true of some other Rogerene marriage, but not of this, for then no doubt would have arisen respecting the validity of the union.

The connection was an unhappy one; violent family quarrels ensued, between the reputed wife, and John Rogers the younger and his family, in the course of which the law was several times invoked to preserve peace, and the elder Rogers himself was forced to apply to the court for assistance in quelling these domestic broils.

The complaint of John Rogers against his son, and "the woman which the court calls Mary Ransford, which I have taken for my wife, seeing my lawful wife is kept from me by this government," is extant in his own handwriting, dated 27th of 4th month, 1700.

In 1703, on the presentment of the grand-jury, the county court summoned Mary Ransford, the reputed wife of John Rogers, before them, declared her marriage invalid, sentenced her to pay a fine of 40s. or receive ten stripes, and prohibited her return to Rogers under still heavier penalties. Upon this she came round to the side of the court, acknowledged her marriage illegal, cast off the protection and authority of Rogers, and refused to regard him as her husband.

Soon after this she escaped from confinement and fled to Block Island, leaving her two children with their father. Rogers appears to have renounced her as heartily and as publicly as she did him; so that actually they both married and unmarried themselves. They had never afterward any connection with each other.

About this time Rogers made a rash and almost insane attempt to regain his divorced wife, then united to Matthew Beckwith. A writ was issued against him in January, 1702-3, on complaint of Beckwith, charging him with laying hands on her, declaring she was his wife, and threatening Beckwith that he would have her in spite of him—all which Rogers confessed to be true, but defended, on the plea that she was really his wife.

"In County Court, June, 1703.—Matthew Beckwith Sen^r appeared in court and swore his Majesty's peace against John Rogers, for that he was in fear of his life from him."¹

In 1710, Mary Ransford was married to Robert Jones, of Block Island; and in 1714, Rogers married the widow Sarah Coles, of Oyster Bay, L. I., the ceremony being performed within the jurisdiction of Rhode Island, by a magistrate of that colony.¹ With this connection there was never any interference.

The troubles of Rogers did not cease with old age. His sea was never smooth. His bold, aggressive spirit knew not how to keep the peace. In 1711, he was fined and imprisoned for misdemeanor in court, contempt of its authority, and vituperation of the judges. He himself states that his offense consisted in charging the court with injustice for trying a case of life and death without a jury. This was in the case of one John Jackson, for whom Rogers took up the battle-ax. Instead of retracting his words, he defends them and reiterates the charge. Refusing to give bonds for his good behavior until the next term of court, he was imprisoned in New London jail. This was in the winter season, and he thus describes his condition :

“ My son was wont in cold nights to come to the grates of the window to see how I did, and contrived privately to help me to some fire, &c. But he coming in a very cold night called to me and perceiving that I was not in my right senses, was in a fright, and ran along the street, crying, ‘ The authority hath killed my father,’ and cryed at the Sheriff’s, ‘ You have killed my father’—upon which the town was raised and forthwith the prison doors were opened and fire brought in and hot stones wrapt in cloth laid at my feet and about me, and the minister Adams sent me a bottle of spirits and his wife a cordial, whose kindness I must acknowledge.

“ But when those of you in authority saw that I recovered, you had up my son and fined him for making a riot in the night, and took for the fine and charge, three of the best cows I had.”

His confinement continued until the time was out for which the bond was demanded. He was then released, but the very next day he was arrested on the following warrant:

“ By special order of his Majesty’s Superior Court, now holden in New London, you are hereby required in her Majesty’s name, to take John Rogers, Senior, of New London, who to the view of said Court appears to be under an high degree of distraction, and him secure in her Majesty’s Gaol for the County aforesaid, in some dark room or apartment thereof, that proper means may be used for his cure, and till he be recovered from his madness and you receive order for his release. Signed by order of said Court, March 26, 1712.

“ JONATHAN LAW, Clerk.

“ Test, JOHN PRENTIS, Sheriff.”

1 Narrative of John Rogers, Jr.

This order was immediately executed. Rogers was removed to an inner prison and all light excluded. But the town was soon in an uproar; the populace interfered and tore away the plank that had been nailed over the window. Some English officers then in town also made application to the authorities to mitigate his treatment, and he was carried to the sheriff's house and there kept. Two days afterward, he received, he said, a private warning that it was determined to convey him to Hartford, shave his head, and deliver him over to a French doctor to be medically treated for insanity. Whereupon by the aid of his son and the neighbors, he escaped in the night, and was rowed in a boat over to Long Island. Thither he was followed by the constable, and pursued by the "hue and cry," from town to town, as he traveled with all possible secrecy and dispatch to New York, where at length arriving safely, he hastened to the fort, and threw himself upon the protection of Governor Hunter, by whom he was kindly received and sheltered. Here he remained three months, and then returned home, where probably he would not have been molested, if he had remained quiet. But no sooner was he recruited, than he returned to the very position he had taken with so much hazard before his imprisonment, resuming the prosecution of the judges of the inferior court before the General Court, for judging upon life and death without a jury in the aforesaid case of John Jackson. He was nonsuited, had all the charges to pay, and another heavy fine.

The next outbreak, and the last during the life of the elder Rogers, is thus related by the son:

"John Rogers and divers of his Society having as good a right to New London meeting-house as any of the inhabitants of the town, it being built by a public rate, every one paying their proportion according to their estate,¹ did propose to hold his meetings there at noon time, between the Presbyterian meetings, so as not to disturb them in either of their meetings. And accordingly, we came to the meeting-house and finding their meeting was not finished, we stood without the door till they had ended and were come out; and then John Rogers told the people that our coming was to hold our meeting, between their meetings, and that we had no design to make any disturbance, but would break up our meeting as soon as they were ready for their afternoon meeting. Whereupon several of the neighbors manifested their freedom in the matter; yet the Constable came in the time of our meeting with an order to break it

1 "The building of the meeting-house cost me three of the best fat cattle I had that year, and as many shoes as was sold for thirty shillings in silver money."—John Rogers, Sen.

up, and with his attendants violently laid hands on several of us, hauling men and women out of the meeting, like as Saul did in his unconverted state, and for no other crime than what I have here truly related.

“ John Rogers was had to Court and charged with a riot, &c. If myself had been the Judge, as I was not, I should have thought the constable to have been guilty of the riot, and not John Rogers. However, he was fined 10s., for which the officer first took ten sheep, and then complained they were not sufficient to answer the fine and charges, whereupon he came a second time and took a milch-cow out of the pasture, and so we heard no more about it, by which I suppose the cow and ten sheep satisfied the fine and charges. This was the last fine that was laid on him, for he soon after died.”

Joseph Backus, Esq., of Norwich, writing in the year 1726, gives this account of the death of the Rogerene leader:

“ John Rogers pretended that he was proof against all infection of body as well as of mind, which the wicked only (he said) were susceptible of, and to put the matter upon trial, daringly ventured into Boston in the time of the Small Pox; but received the infection and dyed of it, with several of his family taking it from him.”

In answer to this statement, John Rogers the second observes:

“ It is well known that it had been his practice for more than forty years past, to visit all sick persons as often as he had opportunity, and particularly those who had the Small Pox; when in the height of their distemper he has sat on their bed-side several hours at a time, discoursing of the things of God; so that his going to Boston the last time, was no other than his constant practice had been ever since he made a profession of religion.

“ Now let every unprejudiced reader take notice how little cause J. Backus has to reflect John Rogers’s manner of death upon him who lived to the age of seventy-three years, and then died, in his own house, and on his own bed, having his reason continued to the last and manifesting his peace with God, and perfect assurance of a better life.”

“ Oct. 17, 1721 died John Rogers Sen.

“ Nov. 6, “ “ John Rogers 3rd, aged 21 years and 6 days.

“ Nov. 13, “ “ Bathsheba, wife of John Rogers 2nd.

“ All of small pox.”¹

Rogers was buried directly upon the bank of the Thames, within the bounds of his Mamacock farm. Here he had set aside a place of family sepulture, which his son John, in 1751, secured to his descendants by deed for a burial place. It is still occasionally used for that purpose, and it is supposed that in all, sixty or eighty interments have here been made: but the wearing away of the bank is gradually intruding upon them. As the Rogerenes do not approve of monu-

ments to the memory of the dead, only two or three inscribed stones mark the spot.

Rogers was a prolific writer. In the introduction to his "Midnight Cry," he observes: "This is the sixth book printed for me in single volumes." He argued upon theological subjects with considerable skill and perspicuity. The inventory of his estate was £410. Among the articles enumerated are :

Several chests and packages of his own books.

Seven Bibles: Powel's and Clarke's Concordances.

CHAPTER XV.

HISTORY OF THE LIVEEN LEGACY—VARIOUS APPEALS TO ENGLAND.

JOHN LIVEEN, a considerable merchant of New London, died October 19th, 1689. He was of English birth, but carried when young to Barbadoes, and knew not that he had father, or mother, or any kindred upon earth. Before emigrating to New London, he had married Alice Hallam, the widow of a Barbadoes trader, who had an estate of about £200, which with the business accommodations of her former husband, passed into the hands of Liveen. She had two sons, John and Nicholas, who when the family came to New London, in 1676, were about twelve and fifteen years of age—John being the oldest. By the will of Mr. Liveen, executed the day of his death, the bulk of his estate, after subtracting some trifling legacies, was bequeathed “to the ministry of New London”—his wife, however, to have the use of one-third of it during her life.

It had been expected that her sons, for whom he had always manifested a becoming affection, would be his heirs, but they were cut off with insignificant legacies. What rendered the will still more extraordinary, was the fact, that Mr. Liveen was, in religion, what was then called an Anabaptist, and had never been known to attend any religious meeting in the town, during the twelve years of his inhabitancy. His business sometimes led him to Boston, and when there, he went to hear Mr. Milburne preach, at the Anabaptist house of worship, and this was his only attendance at meeting in America. He had scruples about taking an oath, and when chosen to the office of constable, would not be sworn in the customary way,

but pledged himself to perform the duty *on penalty of perjury*. The will was written by Daniel Taylor, of Saybrook, then living with Liveen; the executors appointed were General Fitz-John Winthrop, and Major Edward Palmes. It was proved at a special court in New London, at which Governor Treat presided; but the authority of this court was challenged—Sir Edmund Andross having at that time annulled the charter government of the colony, and declared no testaments valid, that were not carried to Boston for probate. The will was therefore kept back, until Connecticut, in 1690, resumed her former government. It was then demanded by the county court for probate. But the colony having restored her ancient system without waiting for instructions from the crown, Major Palmes, who had borne office under Andross, refused to acknowledge the legality of the court, or to produce the will; and General Winthrop, the other executor, was absent with the army, on the northern frontier.

In October, 1690, Mrs. Liveen, in her own name, and the town by its deputies, petitioned the General Court to devise measures for the speedy probate of the will and the settlement of the estate. The widow stated that Major Palmes kept the will, and a ship was then ready for sea, by which "he intended to send to his own country," for orders respecting it. It will be observed that this petition of Mrs. Liveen, implies that she considered the will valid and acquiesced in its provisions.

The affair was again referred to the county court. Before that body, the town brought an action against the executors for not delivering that portion of the estate bequeathed to the ministry. Major Palmes being cited to appear, sent a written refusal, denying the authority of the court as not derived from the crown, and accusing them of arbitrary and star-chamber measures, to which he said *freeborn subjects* could not submit.

The court, however, proceeded to settle the estate upon a recorded copy of the will. The amount of the personal property devised, was estimated at something more than £2,000, but this amount could not be realized. A provision of the will prohibited the sueing of debtors at law, so that the outstanding debts, amounting to some hundreds of pounds, could not be collected, the ground being taken that the testator intended to make his debtors, legatees.

Among the assets, was a vessel called the *Liveen*, burden one hundred tons, which was sold to John Hallam and Alexander Pygan, for £600—Nicholas Hallam being one of the witnesses to the bill of

sale. This act was virtually an acceptance on the part of the sons of Mrs. Liveen, of the will.

Here the case rested, the estate remaining in the hands of the executors, and the town receiving an annual dividend, until the death of Mrs. Liveen, in 1698. By her will she bequeathed the whole estate, which had been kept in a measure integral, to her sons. This will was utterly inconsistent with that of her husband, and therefore the Hallams, before it was exhibited for probate, that is, in October, 1698, applied to the Court of Assistants for liberty to contest the Liveen will, which was refused them. The young men protested, and a special court was appointed to try the case. This court sat in New London, Nov., 1698, and again in 1699. Many witnesses were examined, and great labor expended.

The ground taken by the contestants was, first, the vagueness of the terms used in the will. What does he mean by *the ministry*; he names no person, no sect, no community; the word *ministry* is indefinite and has no construction in law. Again, if the bequest be good to any community, it must be to the ministry appointed and allowed by the laws of England.

On the other hand it was argued that the terms ministers and ministry, in the laws of the colony, and in common speech, had a particular application to persons exercising the sacred office, under the authority of the government of the colony. Neither could the terms in the will apply to a ministry that had no existence in the town. Moreover, Mr. Liveen knew well what was understood by those terms, and in 1688, had voluntarily subscribed to a fund for the support of the minister of New London, Mr. Saltonstall.

The second plea advanced by the contestants was, that Mr. Liveen was not in a condition to make a will, and unconscious of what he did when he signed it. Several witnesses testified that he was confused in mind, in great pain, and overpersuaded by Mr. Taylor to sign the writing. But the most remarkable witness on this side was Major Palmes, who was placed in the singular position of defending the will as one of its executors, and testifying against its validity as a witness for the Hallams. He bore witness to the affection of Mr. Liveen for his sons-in-law—to his often expressed intention of leaving his estate to them—and to his entire dissent from the established ministry of the town. He also asserted that Mr. Taylor had previously written the will, but did not produce it to the view of Mr. Liveen, till the day of his decease, at which time he kept constantly with him, allowing no one to speak to him but in his presence.

On the other side, the testimony was no less ample. Several neighbors, friends and attendants who were all with the sick man, a greater or less part of the day on which he died, testified that his reason, judgment and memory were perfect, till within an hour of his death. He was not then supposed to be near his end; being able to sit up and to move about with help. He was led to the table to sign the will, and as he did it, he said, "I write my name John Liveen." He afterward spoke complacently of what he had done for the town, and Major Wait Winthrop coming in, he showed him the will, and desired him to read it, asking him how he liked it. Major Winthrop then said, "Is this your will, Mr. Liveen?" to which he replied, "It is my last will and testament." Subsequently he observed, "Many will say I am not in my right senses, but I am." To Mrs. Pygan he spoke also of what he had done, saying, "I would not have you troubled that my brother is not an executor of the will; I had a reason for it."¹

The court decided that the case was not sustained, and the will was valid. The brothers appealed to the Court of Assistants, and the case was carried to Hartford. Here the decision of the lower court was confirmed May 2d, 1700. Upon which the contestants demanded permission to appeal to the king and queen, (William and Mary,) in council. This they were prohibited from doing, the right of appeal in such cases being denied by the colonial government, and thus a new element of discord was brought into the conflict. The brothers entered their protest and declared their intention of contesting the right of the colony to forbid an appeal before the English courts. At this juncture one of the appellants was suddenly removed from the scene. John Hallam died at Stonington, Nov. 20th, 1700.

The labor of prosecuting the question of appeal, and of contesting the will, now devolved solely upon Nicholas Hallam, whose determination increased with every difficulty, and rendered him superior to emergencies. He proceeded to England, to manage his interests in person, and was there detained for nearly two years. The question of appeal came within the scope of authority committed to the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations. It was accordingly argued before that body. Sir Henry Ashurst, agent of the colony, endeavored to prove that Connecticut, by its charter, had a right to

¹ According to a custom in those days, Liveen calls Mr. Pygan his brother, because their children were united in marriage: Nicholas Hallam, the step-son of Liveen, had married Sarah Pygan.

hear, determine, and bring to a final issue, all causes and controversies arising within that colony, without any appeal elsewhere. But the lords decided otherwise; the king approved their decision, and Mr. Hallam was allowed to bring his case before the council. Here, the action seemed to remove the settlement of the business to a still greater distance. An order in council of March 18th, 1701-2, set forth that the examinations had not been taken in due form of law, the witnesses not having been interchangeably examined, and therefore the parties should be sent back to Connecticut to correct the error, and all documents must be transmitted under the broad seal of the colony.

The examinations were now to be renewed from the beginning, and scattered witnesses to be reassembled. Major Palmes withdrew his name from the defense of the will, in which he had never heartily concurred, and Fitz-John Winthrop was left the nominal respondent in the case, though it was regarded as an affair of the colony. A court of probate was held in New London in Jan., 1702-3, in which the witnesses were examined by both parties, and subjected to a tedious interrogatory detail. The documents were officially sealed and transmitted to her majesty in council: (King William had died while the case was pending, and Anne was now the sovereign of England.) The case was heard in June or July, 1704; at first it was confidently expected that Hallam would gain his cause, but the respondents having exhibited, in council, the original bill of sale of the Liveen, to which the appellant was a witness, it was regarded as an acknowledgment on his part of the validity of the will, and the decision of the colonial courts was thereupon approved and confirmed.

The defense of the will cost the colony £60. Mr. Hallam is supposed to have expended £300 in contesting it.¹ He made several voyages to England on this business, and when there, used his influence against the colonial government, not only in this question of appeals, but also in the Mason controversy, uniting with the Masons and the Indian party who were then carrying their complaints to the throne. Major Palmes was also in England at the same time, with grievances of his own to cast into the scale against the colony. He had become involved in a lawsuit with his brothers-in-law, Fitz-John and Wait-Still Winthrop, respecting the portion of his wife.

¹ He estimated the expenses of his last voyage and suit in England at £179 1s. 6d., one-half of which he charged, probably with justice, to the heirs of his brother John. They refused to pay it, and on his return from England he was involved in a lawsuit with them for its recovery.

Judgment being pronounced against him in the colonial courts, he also appealed to the king in council, and proceeded to England to prosecute his case. The council, on examination, found no occasion for reversing the decision already made. It is highly honorable to Connecticut, that the judgments of her courts should have been thus repeatedly confirmed by the highest court of judicature in the British nation.

Major Palmes entered warmly into the Indian controversy, denouncing the policy that had been pursued toward the natives, and joining with Mason, Hallam and others, in accusing the colony of having unjustly dispossessed the Mohegans from their lands. Queen Anne appointed a court of commission to issue and determine this case between the colony and the Masons and Mohegans, and Major Palmes was nominated as one of the commissioners. This court sat at Stonington, in 1704.

New London appears to be rather undesirably distinguished for her rash and injudicious appeals and threatenings to appeal, to the laws and authority of the mother country for the settlement of controversies. This was undoubtedly owing to the commercial intercourse which she then enjoyed, direct with England, the number of her people born there, and the influence of her name, which had induced a habit of regarding herself as a *New London*—a portion of the old country lodged on this side of the water. England was nearer to her than to other towns in the colony.

The Liveen property recovered by the town, consisted of two dwelling-houses, a large lot attached to one of the houses, now forming the north side of Richards Street, and extending from the old burial ground to the cove; and in money, £300 sterling, equal to 780 ounces of silver, which was left in the hands of the executor, and afterward of his brother, Wait Winthrop, of Boston, on lease or loan. After the death of the two brothers, it was loaned to other persons, the care of it being invested, by the General Court, in a committee of three persons, viz., Robert Latimer, Joshua Hempstead and James Rogers, (third of that name.) In 1735, Hempstead, the only survivor of the committee, refused to deliver up the papers, or give a letter of attorney to enable the town to recover the money. On application to the General Court, a new committee was appointed, to continue in office like the former, during life, but all vacancies to be filled by nomination of the town. The interest of this money, and the rent of the other Liveen estate, formed a part of the regular salary of the minister, while there was but one recognized church in

town, and was afterward expressly allotted by government, to the Congregational or ancient church.

To avoid the necessity of again taking up the subject of the Liveen legacy, its further history will be sketched here. In the year 1738, there was a general sale of the parsonage or glebe lands of the town, and the Liveen landed estate was disposed of like the rest at auction.¹

It produced nearly £800, and the other glebe lots upward of £500. The Liveen money at interest was then estimated at £600, the whole making an aggregate fund of nearly £1,900; but it must be understood that this was reckoned in the new tenor, or depreciated currency. But even with that allowance, the interest was nearly sufficient to pay the salary of the minister, to which purpose it was without doubt applied for many years. The whole fund has, in the course of time, melted away, and seems to have left no record of its loss behind. We may suppose that the rapid depreciation of the currency, the great commercial losses before the Revolution, and the miseries that the town suffered during the war, affected this as well as all other interests, and reduced it to insignificance. What remained of it after the Revolution, was loaned out in small sums to several individuals, and has probably dwindled away in the bankruptcies of the holders.

1 One of the Liveen houses, stood on Main Street, at the south-east corner of Richards Street. This was bought and taken down by George Richards, who owned the land next to it. The other Liveen house stood opposite on the north-east corner of Richards Street, and was purchased by Daniel Collins. The large lot adjoining was sold in five parcels or house lots; one was bought by Robert Latimer, and has since been a parsonage lot once more.

CHAPTER XVI.

CHRONICLE OF THE EARLY COMMERCE OF NEW LONDON—FROM 1660 TO 1750.

NEW LONDON was settled with the hope and prospect of making it a place of trade. Commerce was expected to become its presiding genius, under whose fostering care it was to grow and prosper. In a letter from the colonial government to the commissioners appointed by Charles II. to inquire into the Duke of Hamilton's claim in 1665, is the following passage :

“ Whereas this colony is at a very low ebb in respect to traffick, and although out of a respect to our relation to the English nation, and that we might be accounted a people under the Sovereignty and protection of his Majestie the King of England, we presumed to put the name or appellation of *New-London*, upon one of our towns, which nature hath furnished with a safe and commodious harbour, though but a poor people, and discapacitated in several respects to promote traffique ; we humbly crave of our gracious Sovreigne, that he would be pleased out of his Princely bounty, to grant it to be a place of free trade, for 7, 10, or 12 years, as his Royall heart shall encline to conferr, as a boon upon his poor yett loyal subjects.”¹

Again, in a letter of 1680, to the lords of the privy council, they entreat that “ New London or some other of our ports might be made free ports for 20, or 15, or 10 yeaeres ;” and in describing the harbor they say, “ a ship of 500 tunns may go up to the Town and come so near the shoar, that they may toss a biskitt on shoar.”²

No royal privileges were, however, conferred upon the port, nor did it need them ; the dowry of nature was rich and ample, and the enterprise and sagacity of the inhabitants were soon on the alert, to profit by their advantages.

¹ Hinman's Antiquities, p. 61.

² *Ut supra*, p. 144.

The affairs of Robert Chanell were settled by the townsmen; Robert Latimer purchased the whole vessel, and all that remained after paying the debts, was remitted to Chanell's wife and children in England.¹

The early coasting trade was principally with Boston. From thence clothing and household goods, implements of husbandry, military accouterments, powder and lead, were obtained. The returns were in peltries and wampum. A petty traffick was also kept up with Rhode Island and Long Island, by boats and small sloops. Very soon the coasting trade was extended to the *Manhadoes*, (New York,) and occasionally to Virginia. In 1662, there was some trade with the latter place for dry hides, and buck-skins.²

With the south, however, the traffick was very limited. "We have no need of Virginia trade," say the magistrates in 1680, "most people planting so much tobacco as they need." Tobacco and wheat were then common articles of culture; not for export, but to the full extent of domestic consumption. These articles of produce are now rare in the state, and in New London county are almost entirely unknown.

The master of a vessel was generally part owner of both craft and cargo, and not unfrequently was his own factor, agent and tradesman. In the small coasters, especially, the master or skipper was entirely independent of orders. He went from place to place, chaffering and bartering, often changing his course, and prolonging his stay on his own responsibility. His boy was under his command; but his man if he had one, frequently brought a venture with him, and might trade on his own account. New London before 1700 was as much noted for these coasting vessels and skippers, as of late years for her fine fleet of smacks and smack-men. Among the early planters, William Bartlett, Mathew Beckwith, Thomas Doxey, Peter Bradley, Thomas Skidmore, Edward Stallion, Thomas Stedman, Thomas Dymond, and many others, were of this class.

Elisha North, a distinguished physician from Litchfield county, settled in New London in 1812 and pursued his professional practice in the town for thirty years. He died Dec. 29th, 1848, aged 73.

1 Among the debts owing him was £15 by Mr. Cornelius Stinwicke at the Munntos (Manhattan) and a hogshead of tobacco "at Kirkatan in Virginia."

2 The least buck-skin was to weigh four pounds and a half. A pound and half of hides was equal in value to a pound of buck-skin—one pound of hides equaled two pounds of *old iron*—two pounds of hides equaled one pound of *old pewter*. Here are old iron and old pewter, having a fixed value, as articles of barter and merchandise!

In May, 1660, "the ship Hope," from Malaga in Spain, with a cargo of wine, raisins and almonds, came into the harbor, storm-beaten and in want of provisions. The master was Robert Warner; and the supercargo Robert Loveland,¹ who had chartered the vessel for Virginia, there to take in a fresh cargo and return to Spain, discharging at Alicant. The voyage had been long and tempestuous, the cargo was damaged, the ship leaky, and information received on their arrival, of the state of affairs in Virginia, induced them to relinquish the intended voyage thither. The supercargo then proposed to discharge the freight and have the vessel "sheathed and trimmed" at New London; after this to take in provisions for Newfoundland, and there obtain a cargo of fish for Alicant, the original destination. The commander refusing imperatively to concur in these measures, Mr. Loveland entered a protest, charging him with having violated his engagements in various particulars. The difficulty was finally settled by arbitration; the cargo was landed and sold at New London,² Capt. Warner paid, and he and his ship dismissed.

From this period Mr. Loveland became a resident in the town, entering so fully into commercial concerns, as to make a sketch of his subsequent history appropriate in this chapter. In 1661 he presents himself as prosecuting a voyage to Newfoundland, and enters a protest against George Tongue, ordinary-keeper, that being indebted to him a considerable sum, which he had promised to pay in such articles as were proper for the intended voyage, which, says the protest, "are only wheat, pease and pork"—when the time arrived and the protester demanded his due, he was told that he must take "horses and pipe-staves," or he would pay him nothing; and these articles were not marketable in Newfoundland.

Mr. Loveland appears to have been often disquieted; and to find repeated occasions for protests and manifestoes. He purchased of Daniel Lane a considerable tract of land at Green Harbor with the idea of building wharves and warehouses and making it a port of entry for the town. When he found it unsuitable for the purpose, he entered a protest against Mr. Lane for selling it to him under false pretenses, charging the said Lane with asserting "that it was a good harbor for shipping to enter and ride, by reason it is defended by a

¹ Robert Loveland was of Boston, 1646. Sav. Win., vol. 2, p. 262.

² Capt. James Oliver, Mr. Robert Gibbs and Mr. Lake, merchants of Boston, appear to have had an interest in the cargo. Among the lading was a quantity of Malaga wine-lees and molasses, for distillation. These commodities were purchased and distilled into liquors, by persons who had recently set up "a still and worm," in the place.

ledge of rocks lying off, and y^t there is 12 feete at low water, betwixt the said ledge and the shore, and within 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ rod of the shore;" whereas he, the said Loveland had sounded and found only shoal water.¹

The title of *Mr.* accorded to Mr. Loveland, probably indicates that he had been made a freeman.

"Oct. 27. 1662. The magistrates have freed Mr. Robert Loveland from watching, warding and training."²

At this immunity was not often granted before sixty years of age, it may be inferred that he was advanced in life. A few more years and we find him on the brink of the grave. On the 27th of November, 1668, he assigned all his estate, whether lands, houses, horses, cattle, debts due by book, bill or bond, either in New England, Virginia or elsewhere, to Alexander Pygan. This bequest was of the same nature as a will and probably indicates the period of his death. It is signed with a mark, instead of his name. Mr. Bradstreet, who was one of the witnesses, testified that Mr. Loveland was sound in mind and judgment, but unable through great weakness to write his name.

A commercial intercourse was very early opened between New London and Newfoundland. Silly Cove, Petty Harbor and Reynolds on that island, as well as St. Johns, were frequented by our vessels. Pork, beef, and other provisions were carried there, and not only dry fish, but West India produce brought back. It is strange that a circuitous trade, involving reshipments and enhanced prices, should have been pursued at a time, when direct voyages from New London to the West Indies were of common occurrence. The trade with Newfoundland was continued till after 1700.

With the island of Barbadoes the commercial relations were more intimate than with any other distant port. Two voyages were made by a vessel yearly. Horses, cattle, beef, pork, and sometimes pipe-staves were exchanged for sugar and molasses and at a later period rum. An interchange of inhabitants occasionally took place. Agencies from New London were established there, and several persons emigrating from Barbadoes, became permanent inhabitants of New London. The Barbadoes trade was the most lucrative business of the period. Merchants of Hartford, Middletown and Wethersfield

1 This land was received back by Mr. Lane.

2 Recorded on the Town Book.

made shipments from New London. Capt. Giles Hamlin, Capt. John Chester and other commanders from the river towns, often took in their cargoes here.¹

In April, 1669, an English vessel, probably built and sent to New England purposely for sale, and called the *America*, was sold by "John Prout, of Plymouth, county of Devon, in Great Britain, mariner"—who appears to have been both commander and owner—to Richard Lord and John Blackleach, of Hartford, for £230. She was seventy tons burden, and was then "riding at anchor in the harbor of New London."

Several vessels were built by Mould and Coit, for the partners Hill and Christophers. Among them were the *New London*, seventy tons, delivered to the owners, June 25th, 1666, and called a ship; the barque *Regard*, 1668; and the sloop *Charles*, twenty tons, 1672. The *New London* was larger than any vessel heretofore constructed in the place, and was employed in European voyages. Thomas Forster, John Prout and John Prentis (second of the name) were successively her commanders. In 1689, her invoice registered "two large brass bells with wheels," consigned to George Mackenzie, merchant of New York.² One of these bells was imported for the town of New London, and was soon after suspended "in the turret of the meeting-house," apparently to the great satisfaction of the inhabitants. It was the first bell that ever vibrated in the eastern part of Connecticut.

The *John and Hester*, stated variously at ninety and one hundred tons burden, was undoubtedly the largest of Mould's vessels. It was built "for the proper account of John Prentis, Senior," and delivered to him October 14th, 1678. One-half was sold to William Darrall of New York for £222, 10s.³ The sons of John Prentis, John and

¹ The following receipt shows the comparative value of two prime articles of exchange.

"Barbadoes—I underwrit do hereby acknowledge to have received of Mr. Jeffrey Christophers one bl. of pork pr. account of Mr. Benjamin Brewster, the which I have sold for 300 lbs. of sugar. Elisha Sanford. Aug. 18th, 1671.

"True copy of the receipt which was sent back to Barbadoes by Mr. Giles Hamlin in the Ship *John and James*. Oct. 29th, 1671. Charles Hill, Recorder."

² This probably notes the first arrival in this country of Capt. John Prout, after ward of New Haven.

³ See *ante*, chapter 18.

⁴ Payment to be made in New York flour at 15s. per cwt. and pork at 50s. per barrel.

Jonathan, both of whom became noted sea-captains, made several voyages in this vessel.

Another vessel owned at this time in New London, and probably built by Mould, was the *Success*, a ketch, rated at fifty-four tuns. A captain, mate, boatswain and one sailor, formed a full complement of men for a vessel like this. The coasters had seldom more than two men and a boy. Sept. 6th, 1677, the *Success*, John Leeds commander, sailed for Nevis, with stock, and in lat. 36° north, encountered "a violent storm of wind and tempest of sea that continued from the Sabbath day to the Fryday following,"—in which they lost twenty-six horses overboard, and sprung a leak, whereupon they bore up helm, returned home and entered protest. The *Success* belonged to John Liveen; and in several voyages to Barbadoes, was commanded by his son-in-law, Capt. John Hallam, of Stonington. In 1688 she was sold by Mr. Liveen, for £114, to Ralph Townsend, late of New Haven, but then resident in New London—who changed her name to *Ralph's Adventure*. She was afterward in command of Capt. Benjamin Shapley.

The little fleet of New London was often thinned by disasters. The barque *Providence*, coming in from sea, was lost with her cargo on the rocks at Fisher's Island Point in the night of Nov. 28th, 1679. The master Thomas Dymond, and his two assistants John Mayhew and Ezekiel Turner, were barely saved. This is not the first instance recorded of wreck upon this dangerous point. The *John and Lucy*, an English merchant vessel, was here totally lost in 1671, and it is probable that her crew also perished.¹

It is not easy to determine the character of a vessel from the nomenclature used at that period. The terms ship and barque were nearly as general in their signification as vessel. Boat, sloop, snow, ketch and brigantine were all of vague import. The *Endeavour*, twenty tuns, of 1660, is called a barque, and another *Endeavour* of fifty-two tuns, built in 1690, by James Bennet for Adam Picket, is also a barque. The *Speedwell* of 1660, fourteen tuns, is a boat or barque; but another *Speedwell* of 1684, Daniel Shapley, master, is styled a ship. To what description of vessel they belonged can not be determined. Probably no three-masted vessel was owned in the port till after 1700.

¹ The guns of the ship were recovered by New London seamen and delivered to the order of Francis Brinley, merchant of Newport, who had been appointed attorney for the owners. The rocks on Fisher's Island Point have lately acquired a fearful notoriety by the loss of the steamer *Atlantic*, wrecked upon them Nov. 27th, 1846.

The list of vessels belonging to New London, as returned by the magistrates at Hartford to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, in 1680, was :

" Two ships, one 70 tons, the other 90 ; three ketches, about 50 tons each ; two sloops, 15 tons each."

This was about one-third of the tonnage of the colony. Shortly afterward the *Liveen*, which is called a ship, and the brigantine *Recovery*, were added to the shipping of the port. The former was owned by John Liveen, and sold after his death, in 1689, for £600. The Recovery was from Southampton, Long Island, and purchased by Alexander Pygan.

The last vessel built by Hugh Mould, that can be mentioned by name, was the *Edward and Margaret*, a sloop of thirty tons burden, constructed for Edward Stallion, in 1681. Mr. Mould is supposed to have come from Barnstable, near Cape Cod. He can be traced in New London, from June 11th, 1662, the date of his marriage with Martha, daughter of John Coite, to June, 1691. He is then concealed from our view, probably by the shadow of death.¹

Another noted ship-builder of this coast, coming next in the order of time, was Joseph Wells, of Westerly, on the Pawcatuck River. Of his vessels we can only mention with certainty as belonging to this port, the *Alexander and Martha*, built by contract in 1681, for Alexander Pygan, Samuel Rogers and Daniel Stanton. The dimensions but not the tunnage are stated.

" The length to be 40 and one foot by the keel from the after part of the post to the breaking afore at the garboard, 12 foot rake forward under her load mark and at least 16 foot wide upon the midship beam, to have 11 flat timbers and 9 foot floor, and the swoop at the cuttock 9 foot, and by the transom 12 foot, the main deck to have a fall by the main mast, with a cabin, and also a cook room with a forecastle."

For payment, the builder was to receive one-eighth of the vessel and £165, of which £16 was to be in silver money, and the rest in merchantable goods. The spikes, nails, bolts and iron work were at the charge of the owners.

John Leeds was another ship-wright contemporary with those already mentioned. He constructed a small brigantine, of eighteen or

¹ He left a son bearing his own name, Hugh, and six daughters. Martha, one of the daughters, married the second Clement Miner, of New London ; but the remainder of the family removed from the town, and most or all of them were afterward of Middletown.

twenty tuns, called the *Tryall*, and sold in 1683, by John Plumbe, for £80 in pieces of eight, paid down, and the *Swallow*, a sloop contracted for by Peter Bradley, 2d, in 1687, but not finished until after Bradley's death.

Almost every merchant that sent out vessels at this period made an occasional voyage himself, either as master or supercargo. Ralph Parker, Samuel Chester, Richard and John Christophers, John and Jonathan Prentis, John and Adam Picket, and the two Hallams, were at the same time merchants and practical seamen. In 1686, the *Prosperous*, a brigantine, thirty tuns burden, was owned by the Prentis brothers, and the *Hopewell*, a ketch, by the Pickets.

After 1680, John Wheeler took a prominent position in the maritime business of the town. A vessel was built for him in 1689 and 1690, for the European trade, and sent out under the command of Capt. Samuel Chester. The owner died before the first voyage was completed, and the vessel was assigned to his creditors, merchants in London.

Two brigantines, styled also ships, the *Adventure*¹ and the *Society*, of sixty-five and sixty-eight tuns burden, both built in Great Britain, were owned in 1698, by Picket and Christophers. The value of such a vessel when new, was about £500.

In 1699, a new building yard was given by the town to John Coit, son of Joseph. This was on the bank, by the side of the Point of Rocks, where vessels of the largest draught might be built. This point was a bold, projecting ledge opposite the Picket lot, and was used for a landing place. Iron rings were linked into the rock, for the convenience of fastening vessels.² The ferry-boat often touched here to land passengers for the lower end of the town, and in 1729, when Mr. Coit built a wharf by the Point of Rocks, the ferry right was reserved.

From the "Boston News Letter," which began to be issued in April, 1704, and was the first newspaper published in North America, a few notices may be gathered relating to New London.

¹ Some of the communion plate of the First Cong. Church bears the inscription, "Presented by the owners of the ship Adventure, in 1699."

² The day New London was burnt, Sept. 6th, 1781, the Lady Spencer, a successful privateer, lay fastened to this rock. All the projecting points have since been leveled and the site is now covered by the wharves and buildings of the Brown brothers. The mansion of the family standing near, was constructed from the stone blasted from the ancient Point of Rocks.

" New London, May 11, 1704. Capt. Edward Parry, in the Adventure, is beginning to load for London, and will sail in about 3 weeks."

" May 18. Capt. Parry, in the brigantine Adventure, being dead, the owners design Samuel Chester, master, who is to go with the Virginia fleet. Mr. Shapley is preparing to go to Barbadoes."

" June 1. Capt. Chester, from New London, and Capt. Davison, from New York, will sail in 10 days for London, with the Virginia Convoy."

These notes show that it was an enterprise of considerable magnitude, and of slow accomplishment, to fit out a vessel for Europe. By further search we find that Capt. Chester sailed on the 12th of June, a month after the vessel began to take in her cargo, and probably missed the convoy, as he was taken by the French. Capt. Davison arrived safe in London.

" New London, Aug. 3, 1704.

" Yesterday, his Honor our Governor, went in his pinnace to Hartford. We are much alarmed by reason of a very great ship and two sloops said to be seen at Block Island, and supposed to be French."

In October, 1707, John Shackmaple, an Englishman, was commissioned by Robert Quarry, surveyor general, to be collector, surveyor, and searcher for Connecticut. He was confirmed in office by a new commission, issued May 3d, 1718, by the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations. His district included Connecticut, Fisher's Island, Gardiner's Island, and the east end of Long Island. The office of surveyor and searcher was afterward separated from that of collector, and the appointment given to John Shackmaple, Jun., in 1728, by James Stevens, surveyor general. Mr. Shackmaple, the elder, is supposed to have died about 1730. His son succeeded him in the collectorship, and the office of surveyor was given to Richard Dursey, of Newport. The residence of these English families in the town was not without influence on the manners of the inhabitants, and their style of living. Major Peter Buor, from the island of St. Christophers, was at the same time a resident, having purchased the Bentworth farm at Nahantick, of the heirs of Edward Palmes, in 1723.¹ These foreign residents, gradually gathered around them a circle of society more gay, more in the English style, than had before been known in the place, and led to the formation and establishment of an Episcopal church.

¹ Before Major Buor's decease, this farm passed into the hands of his creditors, and was purchased by Capt. Dursey, in 1740, which brought it back to the Palmes family, into which Dursey had married.

There was yet another officer connected with the customs, who was styled the naval officer of the district. Christopher Christophers held this office from the year 1715 to his death in 1728.

The following brief notices, collected from a private diary, and arranged as a marine list, will show that a large proportion of the coasting trade centered in Boston, fourteen sloops arriving from thence in six weeks. The year is 1711.

- “ Sept. 8. Braddick arrived from Albany. Skolinks sailed for Long Island.
- “ 12. Manwaring arrived. A sloop was launched by Mr. Coit.
- “ Oct. 13. Wilson and Lothrop arrived from Boston, and 2 sloops more; also a brig from R. I. for Barbadoes, was forced in by the storm, ran on the rocks and was damaged. Capt. Tilleness, (Tillinghast.)
- “ 14. R. Christophers arrived from Barbadoes.
- “ 20. The R. I. brig sailed, and a sloop.
- “ 22. Harris sailed for Norwich.
- “ 26. Tudor and Ray arrived from Boston. Saw a sloop at anchor near Watch Point; thought her a French privateer, but she proved to be Plaisted, of Boston, from the Wine Islands.
- “ 28. Ray sailed for Boston.
- “ Nov. 9. Hamlin arrived from Boston; also Elton.
- “ 28. Two sloops arrived from Boston.
- “ 30. Four sloops in from Boston.”

In 1712, what was called the *Connecticut Fleet* sailed for Boston, 8th of May, under convoy of an armed vessel which had been sent round for its guard, on account of the rumors of French privateers on the coast. A French brig, with 150 men, was soon afterward reported as hovering along the coast, near the entrance to the Sound. It was apprehended that she might turn suddenly into the harbor and fire upon the town. On the 25th of the month, a watch was set at Harbor's Mouth to give notice if an enemy approached.

The passage from Barbadoes usually varied from eighteen to thirty days. Thomas Prentis and Richard Christophers were veterans in this trade. One of the vessels of Capt. Christophers bore the happy names of two of his daughters, “The Grace and Ruth.” Madeira, Saltertudas, the Bermudas and Turks Islands, were also visited by our traders. John Mayhew, for more than forty years, sailed from this port. John Hutton, John Picket, third of that name, Peter Manwaring and James Rogers, were well known commanders. The boys of the town were early familiarized with marine terms and handicraft. Most of the young men, earlier or later, made a few voyages to sea, and many a promising son of a good family was cut off untimely by storm, or wreck, or West India fever.

The vessels built at New London had hitherto been principally sloops; now and then a brigantine, a snow, and perhaps a *brig* had been launched. In April, 1714, Capt. Hutton, who had a building-yard in the lower part of the town, launched a snow, and in January, 1716, a *ship*.

In 1715, Samuel Edgecombe built a *brig*. In 1719, one was built at Coite's ship-yard for Capt. Joseph Gardiner. Sloops had been built not only at New London, but at Pequonuck and at James Rogers' Cove, (Poquayogh.)

In March, 1717, a piratical vessel came into the Sound, and several coasters were overhauled and robbed.

On the 7th of June, 1717, Prentis, Christophers and Picket, in their several vessels arrived from Barbadoes. It was noticed that they had left the harbor together, arrived out the same day, sailed again on their return voyage the same day, and made Montauk Point together.

On the 12th of July, 1723, a Rhode Island sloop, in which Capt. Peter Manwaring and John Christophers, of New London, were passengers, homeward bound, was wrecked on the south side of Montauk, and all on board perished. The surge, heaving the dead bodies and pieces of the wreck on shore, gave the only notice of the event. Manwaring was a seaman of more than twenty years' service. His vessel had been seized and condemned at Martinico, and he was returning home in this sloop.

In May, 1723, a brigantine from New London, called the *Isle of Wight*, Richard Christophers master, was lost near Sandy Hook, on her homeward passage from Barbadoes. She was owned by Benjamin Starr, John Gardiner, Jr., and others.

A prominent article of export to the West Indies was horses. On the 26th of June, 1724, six vessels left the harbor together, all freighted with horses for the West Indies. The craft that carried these animals, from the first commencement of the trade, have been known familiarly as Horse-jockeys. August 16th, 1716, Capt. Hutton sailed for Barbadoes, with forty-five horses on board. This was an unusually large number; probably he was in the *ship* that was constructed under his own direction.

About the year 1720, Capt. John Jeffrey, who had been a master ship-builder in Portsmouth, England, emigrated to America, with his family. He came first to New London, but regarding the opposite side of the river as offering peculiar facilities for ship-building, he

fixed his residence on Groton Bank. In 1723, he contracted to build for Capt. James Sterling, the largest ship that had been constructed this side the Atlantic; and that a favorable position for his work might be obtained, the following petition was presented:

“Petition of James Stirling and John Jeffrey to the town of Groton:

“That whereas by the encouragement we have met and the situation of the place, we are desirous to promote the building of ships on the east side of the river, we request of the town that they will grant us the liberty of a building-yard at the ferry, viz., all the land betwixt the ferry wharf and land granted to Deacon John Seabury, of said Groton, on the south of his land, for twelve years.

“Granted Feb. 12, 1723-4. Provided that they build the Great Ship that is now designed to be built by said petitioners in said building-yard.”

Jeffrey's *great ship* was launched Oct. 12th, 1725. Its burden was 700 tuns. A throng of people (says a contemporary diarist) lined both sides of the river, to see it propelled into the water. It went off easy, graceful and erect. Capt. Jeffrey built a number of small vessels, and one other large ship, burden 570 tuns. It was named the *Don Carlos*, and sailed for Lisbon under the command of Capt. Hope, Nov. 29th, 1733. The capacity of Jeffrey's vessels is reported so large, that the inquiry is suggested whether the tunnage was estimated as at the present time. Nothing appears, however, to countenance a doubt on that point. New London had the reputation, at that period, of building large ships. Douglas, in his *History of the British Settlements*—a work written before 1750—has the following passage:

“In Connecticut are eight convenient shipping ports for small craft, but all masters enter and clear at the port of New London, a good harbor five miles within land [*probably an error in printing for three miles,*] and deep water; here they build large ships, but their timber is spungy and not durable.”

The first reference to a *schooner*,¹ that has been noticed, is in 1730. Two at that time sailed from the port, one belonging to New London and the other to Norwich. In the latter, Nathaniel Shaw, in 1732, went master in a voyage to Ireland. He arrived in port Nov. 7th, having lost on his passage out, five out of fifteen men by the small-pox.

In 1730, an association was formed, called “The New London So-

¹ This denomination of vessel is supposed to be of recent origin. See *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, 1st series, vol. 9, p. 234.

society of Trade and Commerce," which being legalized and patronized by the colonial government, went into immediate operation. Loans upon mortgage were obtained from the public treasury, and the capital employed in trade. It had about eighty members, scattered over the whole colony. John Curtiss, of Wethersfield, being chosen treasurer, removed to New London. The society built or purchased several vessels, and embarked in new channels of enterprise. For a couple of years it promised well, giving a great impetus to business. Public opinion was however behind it; and its misfortunes increased its unpopularity. A schooner sent out by the society for whales, returned unsuccessful, Nov. 13th, 1733. The same schooner was then put into the southern coasting trade. Returning from North Carolina with pitch and tar, she disposed of her cargo in Rhode Island, and coming from thence through Fisher's Island Sound, Jan. 19th, 1734-5, encountered a violent storm of wind, snow and rain, in the midst of which she struck a rock near Mason's Island, and almost instantly filled and sunk. Three out of the five persons on board perished, viz., Elisha Turner the master, Job Taber passenger, and John Gove. This sad calamity, so near home, and after a prosperous voyage, filled the town with solemnity. Mr. Adams preached an admonitory sermon on the occasion, and the body of young Taber, being carried to the Baptist meeting-house, on Fort Hill, after a similar address from the pastor there, was interred with every demonstration of sympathy and respect.

To facilitate its operations, the New London society emitted bills of credit or society notes, to run twelve years from the day of date, Oct. 25th, 1732, to Oct 25th, 1744. These bills were hailed by the business part of the community with delight. They went into immediate circulation. But the government was alarmed; wise men declared the whole fabric to be made of paper; and having no solid support, it must soon be destroyed. Very soon the whole colony was in commotion. The governor and council issued an order denouncing "the new money," and an extra session of the assembly was convened to consider the bold position of the society. This was in Feb., 1738. The legislature dissolved the association, and the mortgages were assumed by the governor and company, and the bills allowed to run, till they could be called in, and the affairs of the society settled.

But the association was not so easily put down, although according to their own statement, "a great part of their stock had been consumed by losses at sea, and disappointments at home," and they were

now assailed by legislative hostility and public odium, the managers determined to hold on, and threatened an appeal to England.

Nov. 21st, 1733, they had a meeting and Wm. Goddard, from Madeira, having made them a present of a quarter-cask of wine, they knocked out the head, and invited those who had been their enemies to drink ; and they themselves drank to the health of the king, queen and Mr. Goddard, and to the prosperity of the society. The great guns were fired, and the sky rung with huzzas.¹ This mode of scattering present trouble was somewhat characteristic of the town. When soberer thoughts came, they retraced their steps, and by their own consent ceased to exist. At a meeting held June 5th, 1735, they unanimously dissolved themselves. The distress to which the society had given birth could not be disposed of so easily. The members were impoverished, and hampered with obligations which they could not discharge. The evils produced by the association could only be effaced by time.

" Sept. 1738.—A Sloop from N L. is lost at Nevis, being upset in a hurricane ; all on board perished. John Walsworth of Groton owned both sloop and cargo. John Mumford was her captain and Thomas Comstock mate."²

" 26 Oct.—John Ledyard of Groton sailed for England in a new Snow built by Capt. Jeffrey." [This was the father of Ledyard the traveler.]

" 16 Jan., 1741-2—James Rogers sailed for Bristol in the new ship."

" May 12, 42.—A large snow in the harbor ; said to be a Moravian : many passengers of both sexes."

" 17 Jan.—1748—A large ship of 200 or 300 tons came in : a prize taken from the French by a N York privateer."

" May 2, 1750—This day 3 brigs from the West Indies arrived together in the harbor. Their commanders were Nath^l Coit, Jeremiah Miller, and Capt. Grose."

" Dec. 7, 1750.—In the morning more than 20 sail of vessels lay in the harbor, mostly bound to the West Indies. Several sailed during the day."

In the year 1751, a brig belonging to Col. Saltonstall, was upset, in a hurricane, on her outward passage. Gurdon Miller, John Hallam and four others were lost. Capt. Leeds and one man were saved.

" Foreign vessels entered and cleared in the Port of New London from 25th

¹ *New England Weekly Journal.*

² Some of these items are from the diary of Joshua Hempstead, Esq. ; others from newspapers.

of March 1748 to the 25th of March 1749, scarce any registered more than 80 tons and generally are West India traders.

Entered inwards		Cleared outwards	
Brigantines	3	Brigantines	20
Schooners	4	Schooners	5
Sloops	30	Sloops	37
	—		—
	37		62 ¹

A fair proportion of this fleet was owned in Norwich, which had become a flourishing town, of six parishes, fast increasing in trade and agriculture, and paid at that time the highest tax of any township in the colony.

¹ Douglas, vol. 2, p. 162. Afterward he says, (p. 180:)

"Connecticut uses scarce any foreign trade; lately they send some small craft to the W. Indies; they vent their produce in the neighboring colonies, viz., wheat, Indian corn, beaver, pork, butter, horses and flax."

This author certainly underrated the exports of the colony. In the article of *horses*, especially, more were brought from other colonies here to be shipped for a southern market, than were sent from hence to our neighbors.

CHAPTER XVII.

GLEANINGS FROM THE COURT RECORDS.

IT was remarked by the inhabitants of other towns that something bold, uncommon and startling was always going on at New London. This was the effect of its commerce, its enterprise, its trains of comers and goers, its compact, busy streets. It was easy to raise a mob here; easy to get up a feast, a frolick, or a fracas. The activity of men's minds outstripped their learning and their reflection; and this led them into vagaries. Men who had long been rovers, and unaccustomed to restraint, gathered here, and sought their own interest and pleasure, with too little regard to the laws. The Puritan magistrates of the town were obliged to maintain a continual conflict with the corrupting influences from without. A changeful, seafaring populace can not be expected to have the stability and serenity of a quiet inland town. Education in the second generation was necessarily much neglected, and on this account many of the sons stood lower in the scale than their fathers. An examination of the court records, fixes upon the mind an impression that this second stage of the settlement was one marked with more coarseness, ignorance and vice, than the one before or after it. We may hazard the remark that religion, law, and the principles of virtue, had less sway for the thirty years preceding 1700, than at an earlier period, or for the next thirty years after 1700. This opinion is given with some hesitation, for offenses change character with the progress of time, and it is easy to mistake the decrease of this or that species of vice, for a radical improvement in morality. The depravity may be as great, yet exist in some new shape; or the particular offense may be as frequent, only kept more out of sight.

With respect to the era of which we are speaking, it may be observed that the rigor of the law was so great, that all the impurities

of the community were made manifest by it. We see what iniquity there was, in its whole length and breadth.

Drunkenness was perhaps more prevalent here than in other towns of the colony, simply on account of the importation of liquors into the port. Selling liquor to the Indians was another offense growing out of position. This, though illegal, was not then regarded as disgraceful; some good men, and even women, were fined for doing it. Another class of offenses heavily amerced, were those which violated religious order; such as swearing, blasphemy, labor, traveling and sailing on the Sabbath, and non-attendance at the customary place of worship. In these particulars, the laws themselves were stringent; they were also rigidly enforced and strictly interpreted. Swearing included expressions which might now be regarded as mere vulgarity; blasphemy and profanity took a wide range, and covered denunciations of the system of worship as established in the colony, or of its officiating organs, whether ministers or magistrates.

Cases of defamation, quarrels and sudden assaults were numerous. Violations of modesty and purity before marriage, were but too frequent, and this in the face of a stern magistracy and strict Puritan usage. Robbery and theft, with the single exception of horse-stealing, were very uncommon.

It is gratifying to know, that many of the offenses committed were by persons who afterward reformed. Men who came into the community with free principles and irregular habits, were soon broken in by the restraints of society, and became, in the end, firm supporters of law and religion. The sons of the fathers also, after having dashed about awhile in defiance of the pulpit and the bench, settled down into industrious and peaceable citizens.

In 1663, the commissioners' court was ordered to be held in New London quarterly: Obadiah Bruen and James Avery, commissioners. Charges in trial of actions were—entrance of the action, 1s. 6d.; trial, 2s. 6d.; warrant, 6d.; attachment, 1s.; witnesses, by the day, 1s. 6d.; secretary's fee, 2s. 6d.; jury, 6d. Constable's fee not mentioned.

Before this court came numerous actions for small debts, and complaints of evil speaking and disorderly conduct. Wills were proved and marriages performed in this court, as well as in the higher courts.

A few examples of cases may serve to illustrate the manners and customs of the age. The following, before the justices or commissioners' court, are abridged and given in substance.

June 30, 1664. Mrs. Houghton summons Mrs. Skillinger before the Commissioners to answer for abusing her daughter in the meeting-house: we not finding

legal proofs hereof, judge it meet that Mrs. Houghton tutor her daughter better and not occasion disturbance in the meeting-house, by any unmeet carriage to her betters hereafter, and this being the first time we enforce no farther.

Complaint entered against Mrs. Katharine Clay for keeping an inmate contrary to order.

Also against Thomas Marshall for abiding at Mr. Humphrey Clay's contrary to order—(i. e., contrary to an order of the Gen. Court forbidding tavern keepers to harbor inmates beyond a certain time.)

Humphrey Clay for entertaining a young man at his house fined 40s. and costs. Thomas Marshall for remaining at Mr. Clay's, fined 5s.

Katharine Clay presented for selling liquors at her house, selling lead to the Indians, profanation of the Sabbath, card-playing and entertaining strange men, &c.

Humphrey Clay was bound over to the court of assistants, to answer for these offenses of his wife. Following the case to this court, we find that Mr. Clay and wife were convicted of keeping a disorderly house, and fined £40, or to leave the colony within six months, in which case half the fine was remitted. Mr. Clay chose the latter course, and sold his land and two dwelling-houses (situated on what was then called Foxen's Hill) to Mr. Bulkley, stipulating to vacate them before Michaelmas.

Minutes of cases before Court of Assistants, 1664, 1665 and 1666.

“ Isaac Waterhouse indicted for throwing the cart and stocks into the Cove.

“ Several persons fined for pulling down Mrs. Tinker's house. A person belonging to Seabrook, for uttering contumelious speeches against his Majesty when in liquor; to be whipt immediately at New London, and a quarter of a year hence at Seabrook; Mr. Chapman to see it done.

“ Uncas versus Matthew Beckworth, Jun., for burning a wigwam of his.

“ Cases of defamation,—Samuel Chester vs. Goodwife Chapple,—Thomas Beeby vs. Hugh Williams, a stranger, for defaming his wife,—Matthew Griswall vs. Wolston Brockway and wife,—Wolston Brockway and wife vs. Matthew Griswall,—Capt. Denison vs. Thomas Shaw,—Capt. Denison vs. Elisha and William Cheesbrook

“ Wolston Brockway complained of by Matthew Griswall for entertaining a runaway at his house.”

Before this court Capt. Denison brought various charges against a young man at Mystic, by the name of John Carr, accusing him of engaging the affections of his daughter Anne without leave—of proposing to her to leave her father's house and marry him—of taking a cap and belt and silver spoon from his house, and finally of defaming his daughter. Carr retracted all that he had said against the young lady, but was fined on the other counts £34, 7s. 6d.

John Carr appears to have had an extra quantity of wild oats to

sow ; the next year he was again arraigned, together with John Ashcraft, for various misdemeanors, endeavoring to entice women from their husbands, concealing themselves in houses, writing letters which had been intercepted, &c. They were fined, and the wives of several men solemnly warned and ordered to take care. (John Carr died 1675.)

Capt. Denison was himself presented at the same session of the court, (1664,) by the constable of Southerton, for marrying William Measure and Alice Tinker, and put under bond of £100 to appear at Hartford, in October, and answer to the presentment, and likewise for such other misdemeanors as shall there be charged against him.

By referring to the records of the General Court, it is ascertained that Capt. Denison forfeited this recognizance ; being three times called he did not appear. His offense probably consisted in the commission under which he acted, which was derived from Massachusetts ; Capt. Denison having hitherto refused to submit to the authority of Connecticut. But in May, 1666, the difficulty was accommodated, and he was included in the indemnity granted to other inhabitants of Stonington.

County courts were constituted by the General Assembly in May, 1666. New London county extended from Pawcatuck River to the west bounds of Hammonasset plantation, (Killingworth,) including all the eastern part of the colony, and the courts were to be held annually, in June and September, at New London.

The first court assembled September 20th, 1666. Major Mason, Thomas Stanton and Lieutenant Pratt, of Saybrook, occupied the bench ; Obadiah Bruen, clerk. In June, 1667, Daniel Wetherell was appointed clerk and treasurer. After this period Major Mason's health began to decline, and he was seldom able to attend on the court ; as there was no other magistrate in the county,¹ the General Court, after 1670, nominated assistants to hold the court in New London annually. In 1676, Capt. John Mason, oldest son of Major Mason, was chosen assistant, but the same year in December, received his death wound. Capt. James Fitch was the next assistant from New London county. He came in about 1680, and Samuel Mason, of Stonington, soon afterward.

County Marshalls. Thomas Marritt (or Merritt) appointed in December, 1668 ; resigned, 1674.

¹ In May, 1674, Major Palms was invested with the authority of a magistrate for New London county, but was never chosen an assistant, though often nominated.

Samuel Starr appointed 1674; resigned, 1682.

Stephen Merrick, appointed 1682.

John Plumbe, appointed 1690.

• *Minutes of cases, chiefly before the County Court.*

“ 1667. Alexander Pygan complained of by Widow Rebecca Redfin, [Redfield,] for enticing away her daughter's affections contrary to the laws of this corporation.

“ Goodwife Willey presented for not attending public worship, and bringing her children thither; fined 5s.

“ Matthew Waller for the same offence, do.

“ George Tongue and wife were solemnly reprimanded for their many offences against God and man and each other. On their submission and promise of reformation, and engaging to keep up the solemn duty of prayer and the service of God in the family, they were released by paying a fine of £3.

“ Hugh Mould, Joseph Coit and John Stephens, all three being ship carpenters, are at their liberty and freed from common training.

“ Wait Winthrop, as attorney to Governor Winthrop vs. James Rogers. Both parties claimed a certain pair of stillyards; Rogers had recovered judgment; it was now ordered that the stillyards should be kept by Daniel Wetherell till Richard Arey should see them.¹

“ 1670. Unchas brought under a bond of £100 for appearance of his son, Foxen,² and two Indians, Jumpe and Towtukhag, and 8 Indians more for breaking open a warehouse. He was fined 50 bushels of Indian corn for his son, 5 pound in wampum to Mr. Samuel Clarke and 20 pound in wampum to the country treasury.

“ Major Mason vs. Amos Richardson, for defamation, calling him a traitor, and saying that he had damnedified the colony £1,000.³ Defendant fined £100 and costs of court.

“ John Lewis presented by the grand jury for absenting himself at unseasonable hours of the night, to the great grief of his parents.

“ John Lewis and Sarah Chapman presented for sitting together on the Lord's day, under an apple tree, in Goodman Chapman's orchard.

“ William Billings and Philip Bill fined for neglect of training.

“ 1672. Edward Palmes, clerk of the court.

“ Richard Ely, in right of his wife, Elizabeth, [Sister] versus John Cullick, as adm'r on estate of George Fenwick. This was an action for recovery of a legacy left said Elizabeth, by the will of Fenwick. Recovered £915 and costs.

“ John Pease complained of by the townsmen of Norwich, for living alone, for idleness, and not attending public worship; this court orders that the said townsmen do provide that Pease be entertained into some suitable family, he

1 For the purpose of ascertaining if they were the same stillyards that the said Arey sold to James Rogers.

2 Not Foxen, the counselor of Uncas.

3 Major Mason also carried this complaint against Mr. Richardson, before the General Court. See Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 2, p. 168.

paying for his board and accommodation, and that he employ himself in some lawful calling.

" A negro servant of Charles Hill presented for shooting at and wounding a child of Charles Haynes.

" 1673. John Birchwood, of Norwich, appointed clerk.

" Widow Bradley presented for a second offence, in having a child born out of wedlock, the father of both being Christopher Christophers, a married man; sentenced to pay the usual fine of £5, and also to wear on her cap a paper whereon her offence is written, as a warning to others, or else to pay £15. Samuel Starr became her bondsman for £15.¹

" Ann Latimer brought suit against Alexander Pygan for shooting her horse; damages laid at 30s. Defendant fined and bound over to good behaviour for presumptuous and illegal carriage in shooting Mistress Latimer's horse.

" James Rogers, Jr., for sailing in a vessel on the Lord's day, fined 20s.

" Edward Stallion for sailing his vessel from New London to Norwich on the Sabbath, 40s.

" Steven Chalker, for driving cattle on the Sabbath day, 20s.

" Sept. 1674. Complaint entered against Stonington for want of convenient highways to the meeting-house. The court ordered that there shall be four principal highways according as they shall agree among themselves to the four angles, and one also to the Landing-place, to be stated by James Avery and James Morgan, within two months.

" Sept. 1676. James Rogers, Sen., John, James and Jonathan, his sons, presented for profanation of the Sabbath, which is the first day of the week, and said persons boldly in the presence of this court asserting that they have not, and for the future will not refrain attending to any servile occasions on said day, they are fined 10s. each, and put under a bond of £10 each, or to continue in prison.

" Matthew Griswold and his dr. Elizabeth versus John Rogers, (husband of said Elizabeth,) for breach of covenant and neglect of duty; referred to the Court of Assistants.

" John Rogers ordered to appear at Hartford Court, and released from prison a few days to prepare himself to go.²

" 1677. Thomas Dunke for neglecting to teach his servant to read is fined 10s.

" Major John Winthrop vs. Major Edward Palms, for detaining a certain copper furnace and the cover to it; damages laid at £5.

" William Gibson owned working on the first day of the week; fined 5s.

" 1690. Capt. John Nash, presiding judge.

" Thomas Dymond vs. barque Providence, stranded on Fisher's Island, for salvage of goods.³

1 Christopher Christophers and the Widow Bradley were afterward married, probably in 1676. Offenses of this nature were often presented by the grand-jurors. This one is noticed on account of its peculiar penalty.

2 This was the commencement of the dealings with the Rogers family. As the subject is amply treated in a foregoing chapter, the subsequent cases respecting them will be omitted in these extracts.

3 This and similar cases that occur show that the county court had cognizance of marine affairs and custom-house duties.

“ 1681. Unchas complains of much damage in his corn by English horses this year.

“ 1682. New London presented for not having a grammar school, fined £10; also for not having an English school for reading and writing, £5.

“ William Gibson and William Chapell fined for fishing on the Sabbath.

“ Elizabeth Way presented for not living with her husband. The court orders her to go to her husband or to be imprisoned.”

Her husband resided in Saybrook, and she persisted in remaining with her mother, at New London. She was the only daughter of John and Joanna Smith. A remonstrance of her husband against her desertion of him is on record at Saybrook. The order of court was disregarded.

“ Capt. George Denison and John Wheeler fined 15s. for not attending public worship.

“ 1686. Chr. Christophers vs. Thomas Lee, for trespass on his land at Black Point. The jury find that a north line from Reynold Marvin's N. E. corner to come to the Gyant's land, takes in a part of the land plowed by Thomas Lee, by which they find said Lee a trespasser, and that he surrender to C. C. all west of said north line.

“ 1687. Mr. Joseph Hadley, of Youngers, in the government of New York, enters complaint against William Willoughby and Mary Wedge, formerly so called, yt the said woman and Willoughby are run from Yorke, and she is a runaway from her husband Ak^o Peeterson, and is now at Mr. Elyes.

“ This court grants liberty unto Mr. Charles Bulkley to practise physick in this county, and grants him license according to what power is in them so to do.

“ Oliver Manwaring licensed to keep a house of publique entertainment and retail drink, 40s. pr. year.

“ Mr. Plumb for his license to pay £3 pr. year.

“ Complaint being made to this court by John Prentice against William Beebe for keeping company with his daughter Mercy, and endeavoring to gain her affections in order to a marriage, without acquainting her parents, which is contrary to law, the said Wm. Beebe is ordered to pay a fine to the County Treasury of £5.

“ At a County Court held at New London, June 4, 1689. Whereas the Governor and Company in this colony of Connecticut have re-assumed the government, May the 9th last past, and an order of the General Assembly that all laws of this Colony formerly made according to Charter, and Courts constituted in this Colony for administration of justice, as before the late interruption, shall be of full force and virtue for the future, until further order, &c.

“ Sept. 1689. By reason of the afflicting hand of God upon us with sore and general sickness, that we are incapacitated to serve the King and Country at this time, we see cause to adjourn this Court until the first Tuesday in November next.

“ 1690, June. John Prentice, Jun., master of the ship [vessel] New London, action of debt against said ship for wages in navigating said ship to Europe and back.

"Nicholas Hallam brings a similar action, being assistant [mate] on board said ship.

"The Court adjourned to first Tuesday in August, on account of the contagious distemper in town.

"July 3, 1690. Special Court called by petition of Mrs. Alice Living, to settle the estate of her husband. Major Palms refusing to produce the will, administration was granted to Mrs. Living.

"Jonathan Hall, of Saybrook, for setting sail on the Sabbath, July 27, fined 40s.

"1693, June. George Denison,¹ grandson of Capt. G. Denison, a student of Harvard College, prosecuted for an assault on the constable, while in the execution of his duty.

"Sept. John Chapell, Israel Richards, John Crocker and Thomas Atwell, presented for nightwalking on the Sabbath night, Sept. 17, and committing various misdemeanors, as pulling up bridges and fences, cutting the manes and tails of horses, and setting up logs against people's doors; sentenced to pay 10s. each, and sit two hours in the stocks."

The first prerogative court in the county was held at Lyme, April 13th, 1699. The next at New London, August 28th. Daniel Wetherell, Esq., judge. This court henceforward relieved the county court from the onerous burden of probate of wills and settlement of estates.

The justices of peace in New London, in 1700, were Richard Christophers and Nehemiah Smith. The former was judge of probate in 1716.

In 1700, Lebanon was included in New London county, and in 1702, Plainfield. The other towns were New London, Norwich, Stonington, Preston, Lyme, Saybrook and Killingworth.

"*Complaints of the Grand Jury to the Court helden at New London, June 4, 1700.*

"New London for want of a Grammar School; also want of a Pound, and deficiency of Stocks.

"Stonington for having no Stocks according to law; also no sworn brander of horses.

"Norwich for want of a School to instruct children.

"Preston for want of Stocks, and not having a Guard on the Sabbath and other public days."

"June 4, 1701. New London County was presented by the Grand Jury as deficient in her County prison, and for not providing a County standard of weights and measures; also for great neglect in the perambulating of bounds betwixt town and town.

¹ This was probably George, son of John Denison, of Stonington, and the same person that in June, 1698, was chosen clerk of the county court. He was son-in-law of Mr. Wetherell, who was then chief judge.

"New London and Lebanon presented for a deficiency in their town stock of ammunition."

Note on Horse-coursing.—In the trade with Barbadoes, Surinam, and other southern ports, no article of export was more profitable than horses. A law was enacted in 1660, requiring that every horse sent out of the colony should be registered, with its marks, age and owner. Accordingly, in 1661, we find recorded :

"Mr. Clay's gray mare shipt for Barbadoes in the Roebuck ; also four mares delivered by Harlakenden Symonds, and one shipt by Mr. Tinker."

As the trade increased from year to year, the raising of horses became an important business, and many farmers entered into it largely.

Lands at that time being in a great degree uninclosed, the animals were let loose in the woods, with the mark of the owner carefully branded upon them. The ease with which they could be inveigled and carried off, and the stamp of the owner obliterated or concealed, encouraged an illicit trade in these animals, which soon filled the courts with cases of theft and robbery. A bold rover in the woods might entrap half a dozen horses with ease, and shooting off through Indian paths by night, reach some port in a neighboring colony where himself and the mark upon his horses were alike unknown ; and before the right owner could get track of them, they were afar on the ocean, out of reach of proof. Many persons, otherwise respectable, entered into this business or connived at it. Men who would scorn to pocket a sixpence that belonged to another, seemed to think it no crime to throw a noose over the head of a horse running loose upon the common, and nullify the signet of the owner, or engrift upon it the mark that designated their own property.

Those who traded in horses, that is, who went round the country, buying them up, gathering them into pounds ready for sale, or driving them to the ports from whence they were to be shipped, were called Horse-coursers. Of these, very few escaped the suspicion of having at one time or another enlarged a drove by gathering into it some to which they had no just or legal claim.

Courts were several times held at New London, Norwich and Stonington, for the trial of persons accused of taking up and appropriating stray horses, and the developments were such as to throw a dark shade upon the habits of horse-coursers. The punishments inflicted were fines and whippings. At Stonington, Jan. 12th, 1683-4, a court was held for the trial of horse-coursers ; it is the first of which any account has been found. Two persons were convicted ;

one was sentenced to pay £10, or to have fifteen lashes; the other £5, or to have ten lashes. Other persons who knew of the offense, which the court calls a crying evil, against which they are bound to bear testimony, and concealed it, were also fined.

Similar instances occurred from year to year; but the delinquency was not upon a large scale. A stray colt was concealed, a mare surreptitiously obtained, a pacer ferreted away, or perhaps three or four horses at a swoop carried out of the colony. But as we approach the end of the century, the disclosures become more alarming. Individuals in all parts of the county, from Lebanon to Stonington, became implicated; some were convicted; others declared "suspiciously guilty."

In June, 1700, an adjourned court was held at New London purposely for the trial of horse-coursers. The penalty for a first offense was a fine of £10 and to be whipped ten lashes; for a second, £20 and twenty lashes; for a third, £30 and thirty lashes, and so on. One notorious offender was convicted three times, but by the clemency of the court, the lashes were each time remitted.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Campaign of General Winthrop on the northern frontier.—Fort built on the Parade.—Province Galley.—Bringing the guns from Saybrook.—Patent.—Proprietors.—Commons.—Court-House.—New inhabitants.

In the year 1690, New York and the New England colonies united in sending an expedition against Canada, from which province the French and Indians had issued and destroyed Schenectady, Feb. 8th, 1690. The command of the land forces was given to Fitz-John Winthrop, who had the rank of major-general and commander-in-chief. Sir William Phipps commanded the fleet. Winthrop marched with his forces to Lake Champlain, but could go no further. The Indian auxiliaries failed; provisions were scarce, and he was obliged to retreat to Albany for subsistence. The fleet was no less unfortunate; it sailed too late, and on arriving at Quebec, found the place too strong for them. After an abortive attempt upon the town, in which they received more injury than they inflicted, the fleet returned home and the whole enterprise utterly failed.

The government of New York was greatly exasperated at General Winthrop's retreat, attributing the failure of the expedition entirely to him. If he had pressed onward they said, to Montreal and kept the French troops occupied in that quarter, Quebec, left defenseless, would have surrendered at the first summons. So great was their dissatisfaction, that on Winthrop's arrival at Albany they procured his arrest, and he was only saved from a disgraceful trial before prejudiced judges, by the bold and adventurous friendship of the Mohawks under his command. They crossed the river, freed their general from restraint, and gallantly conducted him back to the camp.¹

¹ Trumbull's Hist. of Conn., ch. 16.

The reputation of Winthrop in his native colony was not diminished by the disastrous issue of the enterprise. After the strictest scrutiny the Legislature approved of his conduct, and in view of the difficulties that he encountered, deemed that he had acted the part of a wise and discreet commander. But in New York he was regarded with bitter animosity; and the officers belonging to his council, who had concurred in his measures, were obliged to retire with him to Connecticut, there to wait till the fury of the storm was spent. Among these exiles was Captain, (afterward Colonel) John Livingston, who accompanied Winthrop to Hartford and subsequently to New London, where he became a landholder and an inhabitant. He married Mary the only child of General Winthrop, and continued to make New London his home, until November, 1718, when he went to England on some business, and there died.

While the troops of the colony were absent on the Canadian frontier, several French privateers entering Long Island Sound, captured a number of vessels, and with hostile demonstrations greatly alarmed Stonington, New London and Saybrook. The militia from the interior were summoned to the defense of the seaboard, and for a few days great excitement prevailed. But the enemy were not in sufficient force to hazard a conflict, and they contented themselves with a descent upon Block Island, where they took several of the inhabitants prisoners and a considerable booty.

Danger at this time came so near New London that the inhabitants were aroused to the necessity of fortifying the town. Notwithstanding the site for a fort had been so early marked out, nothing in this line had as yet been commenced. Both the town and the colony appear to have relied on the mother country for assistance in fortifying New London.

In 1680 the government, in reply to certain questions proposed by the Lords of Trade and Plantations, speak thus of the town and harbor:

“The Harbor lyeth about a league up the river, where the town is; ships of great burden may come up to town, and lye secure in any winds; where is great need of fortification, but we want estate to make fortification and purchase artillery for it, and we should thankfully acknowledge the favor of any benefactors, that would contribute towards the doing of something towards the good work.”¹

But while they were waiting for aid from abroad, the town might

¹ Hinman's Antiquities, p. 187.

be ruined by a single bold stroke of piracy. The General Court therefore assumed the business, and in the course of the year 1691 a fort or battery was constructed, and furnished the same season, with "six great guns from Seabrook"—probably four or six-pounders. This fortification stood on the point or eastern border of the present Parade, where is now the Ferry wharf. On the higher ground to the west were the magazine and guard-house.

The Province galley was at this time commanded by Capt. John Prentis, (second of that name;) its rendezvous was at New London. In May, 1695, he was suddenly ordered to equip for an expedition—which was to last only three weeks. Men, arms and provisions were impressed for immediate service; May 27th, Mr. Wetherell notes, "Ten soldiers arrived from New Haven and Fairfield Co., impressed for the Province sloop." The object of this cruise has not been ascertained. After this period for several years Capt. Prentis had a general charge and oversight of the fort, by commission from the governor, but no regular garrison was maintained, and the works hastily built, soon decayed.

The warfare on the northern frontier continued, until the mother nations were pacified at the peace of Ryswick in 1697.

The exhibits of debt and credit, dry and trivial as the entries may seem, are often illustrative of the history and manners of the times. A few items from the accounts of the town and county treasurer may be cited as examples.

" 1691. To Sam^{ll} Raymond 5 dayes for fetching ye gunns—he went by land wth his horse, 16s.

" To Capt. Wetherell, 5 dayes do,—wth expense for himself and Raymond and provision for those yt went by water £2. 4s. 3d.

" To John Prentis, Jeremy Chapman, Oliver Manwaring, Nath^l Chappell, Will^m Miner, Thomas Crooker, Thomas Daniels,—for fetching ye gunns from Seabrook, (from 15 to 18s. each.)

" To Mr. Plumbe for his horse boat to fetch ye gunns &c. £1. 10s. 6d.

" To Jonathan Hall pr himself and sloop for ye gunns £3.

" To widow Mary Haris for 15 gls rum and 6^{lb} sugar when the guns were fetcht, £1. 2s. 10d.

" To John Richards for searching ye gunns" &c.

The same year bounty money was claimed for killing twenty-four wolves—of which number Lieut. James Avery killed nine, and John Morgan five.¹ In the accounts of this year we obtain the first inti-

¹ Mr. Wetherell notes, July 30th, 1695: "Paid an Indian for killing a wolf this morning up by Mr. Wheeler's four shillings cash."

mation of a *town's* poor. Various expenses are paid for Mr. *Loyden*, a name that appears no where else in the town's history, and Capt. Morgan is remunerated for "keeping doctor Marret 14 weekes—7s. pr. weeke."

By act of Assembly, May 13th, 1703, an addition was made to the bounds of New London, of a tract between the north bounds of the town and the southern bounds of Norwich, extending from the north-east boundary line of Lyme to Trading Cove, and by the cove to the Great River.

This included the Indian lands or Mohegan reservation, which had long been claimed by the town, but not legally included in their bounds.

" Patent of New London sanctioned by the Governor and Company, 14. Oct. 1704.

" To all persons to whom these presents shall come,—The Governor and Company of her Majesty's Colony of Connecticut in General Court assembled send greeting:—Whereas we the said Gov^r and Comp^r by virtue of Letters Patent to us granted by his Royal Maj^r Charles the Second of England &c. king, bearing date the 23d day of April, in the 14th year of his reign, A. D. 1663, have formerly by certain acts and grants passed in Gen. Assembly given and granted to

John Winthrop Esq.	George Geares
Waite Winthrop Esq.	Thomas Bolles
Daniel Wetherell Esq.	Benjamin Shapley
Richard Christophers Esq.	John Edgecombe
Mr. Nehemiah Smith	Jonathan Prentis
Capt. James Morgan	Peter Harris
John Allyn	Samuel Avery
William Douglas	Robert Lattimore
Joseph Latham	Lawrence Codner
Capt. John Avery	John Turrell
David Calkins	John Richards /
Capt. John Prentis	Peter Strickland
Liev ^r John Hough	Stephen Prentis
John Stubbins	John Plumbe
John Keeney	Samuel Rogers Jun :
Robert Douglas	John Fox
John Burrows	Samuel Beebee
Samuel Fish	Oliver Manwaring
Thomas Crocker	John Coit
Richard Dart	George Chappell
Samuel Rogers Sen ^r	Joseph Miner
John Rogers Sen ^r	John Beckwith
James Rogers	Philip Bill
John Lewis	Thomas Starr
Daniel Stubbins	John Davie

James Morgan Jun:	Peter Crary
Charles Hill	Joshua Wheeler
Joshua Hempsted	Richard Williams
Jonas Greene	Richard Morgan
Joseph Truman	Abel More
Thomas Way	Adam Picket
Jeremiah Chapman	James Avery
Thomas Bayley	John Daniels
Daniel Comstock	Christopher Darrow
Joshua Baker	Andrew Lester
John Wickwire	John Chapel
Benjamin Atwell	Daniel Lester
Thomas Williams	Samuel Rogers (Joseph's son)
Samuel Waller	

with divers other persons and to their Heirs or Assigns or such as shall legally succeed or represent them, or either of them forever, a just and legal propriety in a certain tract of land now commonly called and known by the name of New London, lying and being within the Colony aforesaid, to us by the said Letters Patent granted to be disposed of as in the said Letters Patent is directed, and bounded as hereafter followeth, and the said John Winthrop, Waite Winthrop, &c.—[here the names are all repeated]—with such other persons as are at this present time by virtue of the aforesaid acts and grants proprietors of the said tract of land, having made application to us for a more ample confirmation of their propriety in the said tract of land which they are now in possession of, by a good and sufficient instrument signed and sealed with the seal of this Corporation, therefore **Know Ye**, that the said Gov^r and Comp^y in Gen^l Court assembled, by virtue of the aforesaid Letters Patent and for divers good causes and considerations pursuant to the end of said Letters Patent, us hereunto moving, Have given, granted and confirmed and by these presents do further fully, clearly and amply, give grant and confirm to the aforesaid John Winthrop Esq. Waite Winthrop Esq. Daniel Wetherell Esq. Richard Christopher Esq. Mr. Nehemiah Smith, Capt. James Morgan, with all the other above named persons, and all other persons at this present time proprietors with them of the said tract of land, now being in their full and peaceable possession and seisin, and to their Heirs and Assigns or such as shall legally succeed or represent them or either of them forever, the aforesaid tract of land commonly called and known by the name of New London, lying in the colony aforesaid, and bounded as followeth—that is to say,—on the West by a ditch and two heaps of stones on the west side of Nayhantick Bay, on the land formerly called The Soldier's Farm, about 40 rods eastward of the house of Mr. Thomas Bradford, and from thence North by a line that goes three rods to y^e west of y^e falls in Nayhantick river and from thence North to a black oak tree 8 miles from the ditch aforesaid, which tree hath a heap of stones about it, and is marked on the west side WE, and on y^e east side IP, being an antient bound mark between New London and Lyme, and from that tree East half a mile and 16 rods to a black oak tree with a heap of stones about it, marked with the letter L and from thence north to the northeast corner of the bounds of the town of Lyme and from the said N. E. corner bounds of Lyme upon a straight line

to the Southwest corner of the south bounds of the town of Norwich:—On y^e North by the south bounds of the aforesaid Norwich, as the said bounds are stated from the aforesaid S. W corner down to a Cove commonly called Trading Cove, and from thence by the sd Cove to y^e Great River, commonly called New London river and from the place where y^e said Cove joins to the said river by a line crossing the River obliquely eastward to the mouth of a Cove commonly called Paukatannuk Cove, and from thence by the said Paukatannuk to the head thereof, and from thence upon a direct line to an oak tree marked and standing near the dwelling house of Thomas Rose, which tree is y^e S. E. corner of the bounds of y^e aforesaid Norwich, and from thence by an East line to the bounds of the town of Stonington, which line divides betwixt New London and Preston.—On the east by a line which runneth south from the place where the above mentioned north bounds of New London aforesaid meets with the said bounds of Stonington till it comes to the place where the Pond by Lanthorn Hill empties itself into the Brook, and from thence by y^e main stream of sd brook till it falls into y^e river called Mistick River and from thence by y^e said Mistick River till it falls into the Sea or Sound to y^e north of Fisher's Island:—On the South by the Sea or Sound from the mouth of the aforesaid Mistick River to the west side of Nayhantick Bay to the aforesaid ditch and two heaps of stones about it.—Together with all and singular the Messuages, Tenements, meadowes, pastures, commons, woods, underwoods, waters, fishings, small islands or islets, and hereditaments whatsoever, being parcel belonging or anyways appertaining to the tract aforesaid, and do hereby grant and confirm to the said Proprietors, their Heirs, or Assigns, or such as shall legally succeed or represent them, his or their several particular respective proprieties in y^e said premises given and confirmed according to such allotments or divisions as they the said present Proprietors have already made, or shall hereafter make of the same—

“To have and to hold the said tract of land with the premises aforesaid, to them the said John Winthrop Esq, Waite Winthrop Esq, Daniel Witherell Esq, Richard Christophers Esq, Mr. Nehemiah Smith, Capt. James Morgan, and all y^e rest of the above mentioned persons, and all other the present Proprietors of y^e said tract and premises, their Heirs or Assigns, or such as shall legally succeed and represent them forever, as a good, sure, right, full, perfect, absolute and lawful estate in fee simple, and according to y^e aforesaid Letters Patent after the most free tenor of her Majesty's Manor of East-Greenwich in the County of Kent,—

“To the sole, only and proper use and behoof of the said John Winthrop Esq, with all the above named persons and all others the present Proprietors of said tract and premises, their Heirs and Assigns, or such as shall legally succeed and represent them forever, as a good, sure, rightful estate in manner as aforesaid,—Reserving only to her present Majesty, our sovereign Lady Ann of England &c. Queen, and her successors forever one fiftieth part of all gold or silver mines or ore that hath been or shall be found within the premises so granted and confirmed.

“Always provided that whatsoever land within the aforesaid tract which formerly did and now doth belong unto, and is the just and proper right of Uncas late Sachem of Mohegan, or Owaneco his son or any other Indian Sachem whatsoever, and hath not yet been lawfully purchased of the said Sachems, or

acquired by the English, doth and shall still remain y^e right and property of y^e said Indian Sachems or their Heirs, and shall not be entered upon, or improved, or claimed as property by the aforesaid persons to whom the said tract is hereby confirmed, or any of them by virtue of this instrument, nor shall anything herein contained be at any time deemed, taken or construed to the prejudice of any of the said Sachems or their Heirs right to the said land within the said tract aforesaid which hath not yet been sold or alienated by them, but their said right shall be and remain good and free to them to all intents and purposes in the Law, and the said land which they have right in aforesaid shall be and remain as free for their own proper occupation and improvement as if it had not been included in the bounds of the aforesaid New London, as specified in this instrument—

“ And further, we the said Gov^r and Comp^y y^e aforesaid tract of land and premises and every part and parcel thereof hereby granted and confirmed to the said John Winthrop, Waite Winthrop, Daniel Wetherell &c.—[here all the names are again repeated]—and the rest of the present proprietors thereof, their Heirs and Assigns, or such as shall legally succeed and represent them to their own proper use and uses in the manner and under the limitation above expressed against us and all and every other person or persons lawfully claiming by, from or under us, shall and will warrant and forever defend by these presents—

“ In witness whereof we have ordered the present instrument to be signed by the Deputy Gov^r of this Corporation and by y^e Secretary of the same as also that the seal of this Corporation be affixed hereunto this 14th day of October in y^e third year of her Maj^r Reign A. D. 1704.

“ ROBERT TREAT Dep. Gov^r.

“ ELEAZER KIMBERLY Sec^r”

Though only seventy-seven names are registered in the patent, the whole number of full-grown men having a right in the town was perhaps at that time one hundred and sixty or one hundred and seventy. A man might have three or four sons of mature age, yet generally in the patent, only the father, or the father and eldest son were mentioned. Other names were also omitted which ought to have been enrolled, and which were added to the list of patentees afterward. These were Lieut. John Beeby, Thomas, son of Sergt. Thomas Beeby, Samuel Fox, Samuel Chapman, William Gibson, Nicholas and Amos Hallam, Sampson Haughton, Jonathan Haynes, William Hatch, Alexander Pygan, Joshua Raymond and Hon. Gurdon Saltonstall.

“ 13 Decr. 1703.

“ Voted, that the Town Patent, be forthwith drawn upon parchment and that all the freeholders of this town who are desirous to have their names entered therein, shall bring them to the Moderator within a month.”

This vote was never carried into effect.

The commons of the town were a source of great agitation and discord. The inhabitants could not agree upon a principle according to which they should be divided. One party would have had them distributed equally to the whole body of voters; another, with Governor Saltonstall at the head, was for restricting them to proprietors. The contention was protracted and acrimonious.

In 1724, the proprietors were regularly enrolled, and henceforward held their meetings distinct from the freeholders. Divisions of land were limited to patentees, and no person was a patentee, who was not a lawful proprietor before the date of the patent, May 10th, 1703.

The whole commonage was arranged in three great divisions:

1. The inner or grass commons, in and near the town.
2. The middle or wood commons.
3. Outside commons; included in the north parish, and divided from the town by "a line running from New London N. W. corner tree, to white rock in Mohegan River."

The first meeting of the proprietors was held Jan. 21st, 1728-4; John Richards clerk, who held the office till near the period of his death in 1765. No meeting is entered on record between April 15th, 1740, and March 5th, 1762. Later than this they occurred generally at intervals of four or five years.

It has been heretofore observed, that the river border of the town, in the line of Water and Bank Streets, had been left unappropriated—a common belonging to the town. On the bank a few lots were sold in 1714, but afterward resumed, and the whole, with reservations here and there of a common way to the water, were disposed of between 1722 and 1724. Each lot was about three rods in breadth upon the water, and the average price £3. The proceeds of the sales were appropriated to the building of a house for town meetings and the accommodation of the courts.

This court-house, the first in the eastern part of Connecticut, stood at the south-east corner of the meeting-house square, or *green*, fronting west. It was raised April 20th, 1724. The length was forty-eight feet; half as wide, and twenty feet between joints: the builder John Hough; the cost £48. When finished, the arms and ammunition of the town were lodged in the garret, and "Solomon Coit was chosen to keep the town magazine *gratis*." This house, with repairs, continued in use till 1767.

New Inhabitants that appear between 1670 and 1700.

[The exact period of settlement can not always be obtained; many of the dates are merely an approximation to the time of arrival. By the phrase *east of the river*, the present towns of Groton and Ledyard are indicated; by the *North Parish*, Montville; and by *Nahantick, Jordan and Great Neck*, Waterford.]

Ames, John and David; probably brothers, and it is conjectured from Andover, Mass.—settled east of the river about 1696. The name is often written Eams and Emms.

Ashby, Anthony; at Mystic 1688, and perhaps earlier.

Baker, Joshua; from Boston, not long after 1670.

Blake, Jeremiah; bought land in July, 1681—on the list of 1688, &c.

Bodington, or Buddington, Walter; east of the river in 1679.

Brookes, Henry; living at Nahantick in 1699.

Bucknall or Buckland, Samuel; cattle-mark recorded in 1674. He married, (1) the widow of Matthew Beckwith, Sen.; (2) the widow of Philip Bill, Sen.

Bulkley, Dr. Charles; son of Rev. Gershom—licensed by the Co. Court to practice physic, and settled in the town 1687.

Butler, Thomas and John; before 1690, and perhaps much earlier.

Button, Peter; in the North Parish, probably before 1700.

Camp, William; in the Jordan District, before 1690.

Cannon, Robert; accepted as an inhabitant in town meeting, 1678.

Carder, Richard; east of the river, about 1700.

Carpenter, David; at Nahantick ferry, 1680.

Chandler, John; licensed to keep a house of entertainment, 1698.

Cherry, John; a transient inhabitant about 1680.

Crary, Peter; east of the river; cattle-mark is recorded in 1680.

Darrow, George; between 1675 and 1680.

Davis, Andrew; east of the river about 1680.

Davie, John; bought farm at Pequonuck, (Groton,) 1692.

Denison, George; son of John of Stonington; of New London, 1694.

Dennis, George; from Long Island, about 1680.

Dodge, Israel; on a farm in the North Parish, 1694.

Ellis, Christopher; admitted inhabitant 1682.

Edgecombe, John; about 1673.

Fargo, Moses; house lot granted 1680.

Fountain, Aaron; son-in-law of Samuel Beeby. His house on the Great Neck is mentioned in 1683.

Foote, Pasco; 1678—son-in-law of Edward Stallion.

Fosdick, Samuel; from Charlestown, Mass., 1680.

Fox, two brothers, Samuel and John, about 1675.

Gibson, Roger, and his son William; living on the Great Neck in 1680.

Gilbert, Samuel, in North Parish; on a list subscribing for the ministry of New London, in 1688.

Green, Jonas; probably of the Cambridge family of Greens—commanded a coasting vessel, and fixed his residence in New London, in 1694, lived on Mill Cove, in a house sold by his descendants to John Colfax.

Hackley, Peter; erected a fulling-mill at Jordan, 1694.

Hall, Jonathan ; in 1678 or 1677, he exchanged his accommodations in New Haven, for those of John Stevens in New London.

Halsey, William ; 1689.

Harvey, John ; at Nahantick, 1682.

Hatch, William ; about 1690.

Hawke, or Hawkes, John ; a serge-maker, 1698.

Haynes, Josiah ; at Pequonuck, (Groton,) 1696.

Holloway, Jacob ; about 1700.

Holmes, Thomas ; he had wife, Lucretia. Their son John was born March 11th, 1686.

Holt, Nathaniel ; 1673.

Hubbard, Hugh ; about 1670 ; from Derbyshire, Eng.

Hubbell, Ebenezer ; from Stratfield, Fairfield Co., after 1690.

Hurlbut, Stephen ; about 1695, probably from Windsor.

Hutchinson, George ; about 1680. His wife Margaret, obtained a divorce from him in 1696, on the plea of three years' absence and desertion.

Jennings, Richard ; from Barbadoes, 1677.

Johnson, Thomas and Charles ; before 1690.

Jones, Thomas ; 1677, probably from Gloucester, Mass.

Leach, or Leech, Thomas ; about 1680.

Leeds, John ; from Kent Co., Eng., 1674.

Loomer, Stephen ; 1697.

Mayhew, John ; from Devonshire, Eng., 1676.

Maynard, Zachariah ; "formerly living at Marlborough;" settled east of the river, beyond Robert Allyn, 1697.

McCarty, Owen ; 1693.

Minter, Tobias ; son of Ezer, of Newfoundland, married 1672, died 1673.

Minter, Tristram ; his relict in 1674 married Joshua Baker.

Mitchel, or Mighill, Thomas ; a ship-wright, had his building-yard in 1696, near the Fort land.

Mortimer, Thomas ; often Maltimore ; a constable in 1690.

Munsell, or Munson, Thomas ; on the Great Neck, 1683.

Mynard, or Maynard, William ; about 1690, from Hampshire, Eng.

Nest, Joseph ; 1678.

Pember, Thomas ; 1696.

Pemberton, Joseph ; from Westerly, after 1680.

Pendall, William ; mariner and ship-wright, 1676.

Persey, Robert ; a transient inhabitant ; bought a house 1678, sold it 1679.

Plimpton, Robert ; 1681.

Plumbe, John ; before 1680.

Potts, William ; from Newcastle, Eng., 1678 ; married a daughter of James Avery ; was constable east of the river 1684.

Rice, Gershom ; east of the river, before 1700.

Rose-Morgan, Richard ; 1683.

Russell, Daniel, 1675.

Satterly, Benedict ; after 1680.

Seabury, John ; east of the river before 1700.

Scarritt, Richard, 1695.

Singleton, Richard ; east of the river ; cattle-mark recorded 1686.

Springer, Dennis; land granted him east of the river in 1696.
Steer, Richard; 1690.
Strickland, Peter; probably about 1670.
Swaddel, William; east of the river; cattle-mark 1689.
Thorne, William; from Dorsetshire, Eng. He married in 1676, Lydia, relict of Thomas Bayley. East of the river.
Turner, Ezekiel; son of John, of Situate, 1678.
Walker, Richard; 1695.
Walworth, William; east of the river, about 1690.
Way, Thomas; about 1687.
Weeks, John; east of the river before 1700; probably from Portsmouth, N. H.
Wickwire, John; 1676.
Willett, James; accepted inhabitant, 1681. He was from Swansea, and bought the farm of Wm. Meades, east of the river.
Willett, John; 1682.
Williams, Thomas; 1670.
Williams, John; east of the river; his name is on the ministry subscription list of 1688.
Willoughby, William; about 1697.
Young, Thomas; from Southold, 1693, married Mary, relict of Peter Bradley, 2d.

CHAPTER XIX.

OBITUARIES OF THE EARLY SETTLERS.

TAKING our position on the high ground at the beginning of a new century, let us pause and review the band of early settlers, who siting down among these barren rocks, erected these buildings, planted these gardens, manned these decks, and from Sabbath to Sabbath led their children up these winding paths to worship God in that single church—that decent and comely building, plain in appearance, but beautified by praise, which sate on the hill-top, side by side with the lowly mansions of the dead. From those silent chambers let us evoke the shades of the fathers, and record some few fragments of their history, not irrecoverably buried with them in the darkness of oblivion.

There is an interest lingering about these early dead which belongs to no later race. The minutest details seem vivid and important. A death in that small community was a great event. The magistrate, the minister, and the fathers of the town, came to the bed of the dying to witness his testament and gather up his last words. It was soon known to every individual of the plantation that one of their number had been cut down. All were eager once more to gaze upon the face they had known so well; they flocked to the funeral; the near neighbors and coevals of the dead bore him on their shoulders to the grave; the whole community with solemn step and downcast eyes, followed him to his long home.

Riding at funerals was not then in vogue; and a hearse was unknown. A horse litter may in some cases have been used; but the usual mode of carrying the dead was on a shoulder bier. In this way persons were sometimes brought into town for interment even from a distance of five or six miles. Frequent rests or halts were made, and the bearers often changed. These funeral customs continued down to the period of the Revolution.

Our ancestors do not often appear to us in all the homeliness of their true portraiture. Imagination colors the truth, and we overlook the simplicity of their attire and the poverty of their accommodations. Estates before 1700 were small; conveniences few, and the stock of furniture and garments extremely limited. Many of the large estates of modern times have been built up from very small beginnings.

Each man was in a great measure his own mechanic and artisan, and he wrought with imperfect tools. Most of these tools were made of *Taunton iron*; a coarse bog ore, which could produce only a dull edge, and was easily broken. The value of iron may be inferred from the fact that *old iron* was of sufficient importance to be estimated among movables. In the early inventories very few *chairs* are mentioned. Stools, benches and forms, took their place; joint-stools came next, and still later, many families were provided with the high-backed *settle*, a cumbersome piece of furniture, but of great comfort in a farmer's kitchen. A broad box-like cupboard, with shelves above, where the pewter was arranged, and called the *dresser*, was another appendage of the kitchen. The houses were cheaply, rudely built, with many apertures for the entrance of wind and frost; the outside door frequently opening directly into the family room, where the fire-place was wide enough to admit an eight feet log, and had a draught almost equal to a constant bellow. The most finished timbers in the house, even those that protruded as sills and cross-beams in the best rooms, were hatchet-hacked, and the wainscoting unplaned.

One of the first objects with every thrifty householder, was to get apple-trees in growth. Most of the homesteads consisted of a house, garden and orchard. Cider was the most common beverage of the country. Some beer was drank. They had no tea nor coffee, and at first very little sugar or molasses. When the trade with Barbadoes commenced, which was about 1660, sugar and molasses became common. The latter was often distilled after importation. Broth, porridge, hasty-pudding, johnny-cake and samp, were articles of daily consumption. They had no potatoes, but beans and pumpkins in great abundance.

Of the first-comers, 1650 or before, John Stebbins, George Chapel, Thomas Parke, Thomas Roach, and three of the Beeby brothers, lived into the eighteenth century: Thomas Beeby, the other brother, died but a short time previous. John Gager was living, but in another settlement. Alexander Pygan, Oliver Manwaring, and some others who had settled in the town before 1660, were yet upon

the stage of life. The deaths that strew the way, are thinly scattered, showing that life and health were here as secure from disease, excepting only one or two seasons of epidemic sickness, as in the most favored portions of New England.

Jarvis Mudge and Thomas Doxey.

Mention has already been made of the decease of these two persons in the year 1652, the first deaths in the plantation. Jarvis Mudge had married at Wethersfield, in 1649, the relict of Abraham Elsing. His wife had two daughters by her former husband, and Mr. Mudge left two sons, Moses and Micah; but of ages unknown, and it cannot therefore be decided whether they were the children of this or some former wife. Moses Mudge, in 1696, was of Sharon, and Micah, in 1698, of Lebanon. Thomas Doxey left a son Thomas, who in 1673, sold some estate that had belonged to his father, "with consent of my mother, Katherine, wife of Daniel Lane." No other child is mentioned. The removal of Daniel Lane, after a few years, to Long Island, carried the whole family from New London.

Walter Harris, died November 6th, 1654.

A vessel called the William and Francis, came to America in 1632, bringing among its passengers, Walter Harris,¹ who settled in Weymouth, where he remained about twenty years, and then came to Pequot Harbor. On his first application for a house-lot, he is styled of Dorchester, which makes it probable that his last temporary abiding place had been in that town. He had two sons, Gabriel and Thomas. His wife, whose maiden name was Mary Fry,² survived him less than three months; one inventory and settlement of estate sufficed for both.

The nuncupative will of Mrs. Harris will be given at large, omitting only the customary formula at the commencement. It is one of the oldest wills extant in the county, and is rich in allusions to costume and furniture. From a clause in this will it may be inferred that Thomas Harris had been betrothed to Rebecca, daughter of Obadiah Bruen. This young man, according to tradition, had been sent to England to recover some property that had fallen to the fam-

¹ Savage, (MS.)

² See will of William Fry, in Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol. 2, p. 385.

ily, and was supposed to have been lost at sea, as he was never heard of afterward.

" The last Will and Testament of Mary Harries, taken from her owne mouth this 19th of Jan., 1655.

" I give to my eldest daughter, Sarah Lane, the bigest brass pan, and to her daughter Mary, a silver spoone. And to her daughter Sarah, the bigest pewter dish and one silken riben. Likewise I give to her daughter Mary, a pewter candlestick.

" I give to my daughter, Mary Lawrence, my blew mohere petticoate and my straw hatt and a fether boulster. And to her eldest sonne I give a silver spoone. To her second sonne a silver whissle. I give more to my daughter Mary, my next brasst pann and a thrum cushion. And to her yongest sonne I give a pewter bassen.

" I give to my yongest daughter, Elizabeth Weekes, a peece of red broad cloth, being about two yards, alsoe a damask livery cloth, a gold ring, a silver spoone, a fether bed and a boulster. Alsoe, I give to my daughter Elizabeth, my best hatt, my gowne, a brass kettle, and a woolen jacket for her husband. Alsoe, I give to my daughter Elizabeth, thirty shillings, alsoe a red whittle,¹ a white apron and a new white neck-cloth. Alsoe, I give to my three daughters aforesaid, a quarter part to each of them, of the dyaper table cloth and tenn shillings apeece.

" I give to my sister Miggis, a red petticoat, a cloth jacket, a silke hud, a quoife,² a cross-cloth, and a neck-cloth.

" I give to my cosen Calib Rawlyns ten shillinges.

" I give to my two cosens, Mary and Elizabeth ffry, each of them five shillinges.

" I give to Mary Barnet a red stuff wascote.

" I give to my daughter, Elizabeth, my great chest. To my daughter, Mary, a ciffer³ and a white neck-cloth. To my sister, Hannah Rawlin, my best cross cloth. To my brother, Rawlin, a lased band. To my two kinswomen, Elizabeth Hubbard and Mary Steevens, five shillinges a peece.

" I give to my brother, Miggis, his three youngest children, two shillinges sixe pence a peece.

" I give to my sonne Thomas, ten shillinges, if he doe come home or be alive.

" I give to Rebekah Bruen, a pynt pott of pewter, a new petticoate and wascote wch she is to spin herselfe; alsoe an old byble, and a hatt wch was my sonn Thomas his hatt.

" I give to my sonne Gabriell, my house, land, cattle and swine, with all other goodes reall and psonall in Pequet or any other place, and doe make him my sole executor to this my will. Witness my hand,

" Witness hearunto,

The mark of  MARY HARRIES.

" John Winthrop,

" Obadiah Bruen,

" Willm Nyccolls."⁴

1 A kind of short cloak.

2 A cap.

3 Some kind of cap or head-dress. Quoif and ciffer are from the French *coiffes* and *coiffure*.

4 New London Records, lib. 8.

The Harris family ranked in point of comfort and accommodations with the well-to-do portion of the community. They had a better supply of *pewter* than is found in many early inventories, and such articles of convenience as a gridiron, chopping-knife, brewing tub, smoothing-iron, "four silver spoons and two cushions." The house consisted of a front-room, lean-to, shop-room and two chambers.

Gabriel Harris died in 1684; Elizabeth, his relict, August 17th, 1702.

The inventory of Gabriel Harris, compared with that of his father, illustrates the rapid march of improvement in the plantation. The homestead, consisting of a new house, orchard, cider-mill and smith's shop, valued together at £200, was assigned to Thomas, the eldest son, for his double portion. The inheritance of the other children, six in number, was £100 each. Among the wearing apparel are:

- " A broad-cloth coat with red lining.
- " Two Castors, [beaver hats.]
- " A white serge coat: a Kersey coat.
- " A serge coat and doublet: a wash-leather doublet.
- " Two red wescotes—a stuff coat and breeches.
- " Four looms and tackling: a silk loom.
- " An Indian maid-servant, valued at £15.
- " Three Canoes," &c.

Thomas Harris, oldest son of Gabriel, died in Barbadoes, June 9th, 1691, leaving an estate estimated at £927. His relict, Mary, (a daughter of Daniel Wetherell,) married George Denison, grandson of George the first, of Stonington. His only child, Mary, born Nov. 4th, 1690, was regarded as the richest heiress in the settlement. About 1712, she became the wife of Walter Butler.

Peter Collins, died in May or June, 1655.

He is generally styled *Mr. Collins*. His will and inventory are almost all that is known of him. Apparently he had no family and lived alone. He distributes his effects, appraised at £57, among his neighbors and friends; the house and land to Richard Poole. The simplicity of the age is shown in the small number of articles with which he accomplished his house-keeping: a bed and one pillow; a blanket, a sheet and a green coverlet; one chair, three forms, two barrels, three brass kettles, one iron pot, one frying-pan, a butter-tub and a quart pot. These were all the accommodations sufficiently important to be noticed, of a man who seems to have been respected

and respectable,—who had house and lands and three cows; a valuable article at that period—with some other stock. The milk-keelers, trenchers, and wooden spoons, whittled out, or bought of Indians, were probably considered of too little value to be appraised.

Robert Isbell, died about 1655.

He may have been the Robert Isabell who had land granted him in Salem 1637.¹ He left, relict Ann, (who married William Nicholls,) and two children Eleazar and Hannah. Eleazar married Nov. 1st, 1668, Elizabeth French and removed to Killingworth, where he died, 1677.

Hannah Isbell married first Thomas Stedman, August 6th, 1668, and second John Fox, both of New London.

Robert Hempstead, died in June, 1655.

The following memorandum is appended to his will:

“The ages of my 3 children.
Mary Hempsted was borne March 26th, 1647.
Joshua Hempsted my sonne was borne June 16, 1649.
Hannah Hempsted was borne April 11, 1652.
This I Robert Hempsted testifie under my hand.”

The name of Robert Hempstead has not been traced in New England previous to its appearance on our records. It is probable that when he came to Pequot with Winthrop in 1645, he had recently arrived in the country and was a young, unmarried man. A report has obtained currency that he was a knight and entitled to the address of *Sir*. This idea is not countenanced by anything that appears on record. It originated probably from the rude handwriting of the recorder, in which an unskillful reader might easily mistake the title of *Mr.* for that of *Sir*.

In regard to Mary Hempstead, the first-born of New London, we may allow fancy, so long as she does not falsify history, to fill up the brief outline that we find on record, with warm and vivid pictures. We may call her the first fair flower that sprang out of the dreary wilderness; the blessed token that families would be multiplied on these desolate shores, and homes made cheerful and happy with the presence of children. We may think of her as beautiful and good;

¹ Felt's History of Salem, p. 169.

pure like the lily; fresh and blooming like the rose: yet not a creature of romance, too ethereal for earthly fellowship, floating a few years through bower and hall, and then exhaled to Eden—but a noble-hearted, much-enduring woman; prudent, cheerful and religious; working diligently with her hands, living to a goodly age, and rearing to maturity a family of ten children, two sons and eight daughters, an apt and beautiful symbol for the young country.

Mary Hempstead was united in marriage with Robert Douglas, Sept. 28th, 1665. She had eleven children, one of whom died in infancy. Having lived to see the other *ten* all settled in families of their own, she fell asleep, December 26th, 1711. Her husband was gathered by her side January 15th, 1715-6.

Hannah Hempstead married first, Abel Moore, and second, Samuel Waller. Joanna, the relict of Robert Hempstead, married Andrew Lester. Joshua, the only son of Robert Hempstead, married Elizabeth, daughter of Greenfield Larrabee. This couple had a family of eight daughters and an only son, Joshua, who was born Sept. 1st, 1678, and with him the male line of the family again commences. This person—Joshua Hempstead, 2d—took an active part in the affairs of the town for a period of fifty years, reckoning from 1708. The “Hempstead Diary,” repeatedly quoted in this history, was a private journal kept by him, from the year 1711 to his death in 1758. A portion of the manuscript has been lost, but the larger part is still preserved. Its contents are chiefly of a personal and domestic character, but it contains brief notices of town affairs and references to the public transactions of the country.

Its author was a remarkable man—one that might serve to represent, or at least illustrate, the age, country and society in which he lived. The diversity of his occupations marks a custom of the day: he was at once farmer, surveyor, house and ship carpenter, attorney, stone-cutter, sailor and trader. He generally held three or four town offices; was justice of the peace, judge of probate, executor of various wills, overseer to widows, guardian to orphans, member of all committees, every body's helper and adviser, and *cousin* to half of the community. Of the Winthrop family he was a friend and confidential agent, managing their business concerns whenever the head of the family was absent.

The original homestead of Robert Hempstead remains in the possession of one branch of his descendants. The house now standing on the spot, is undoubtedly the most ancient building in New London. It is nevertheless a house of the second generation from the settle-

ment. The first houses, rude and hastily built, passed away with the first generation. The age of the Hempstead house is determined by the Hempstead diary. The writer occupied the dwelling, and writing in 1743, says it had been built sixty-five years.

Other items from the diary that may be interesting in this connection are the following.

"April 26, 1729 my aunt Waller died, aged 77, youngest daughter of my grand-father Hempstead and born near this house, in the old one built by my grandfather."

"Mary, wife of Robert Douglas was my father's eldest sister and born in New London in Jan: 1646-7,—the first child of English parents born in this town." (Mistake in the month, compared with the date in her father's will.)

21 Jan: 1738-9—Cut down one half of the great yellow apple tree, east from the house, which was planted by my grandfather 90 years ago.

• *William Roberts, died in April or May, 1657.*

Little is known of him. He had been in the service of Mr. Stanton and had settled but recently in Pequot. He lived alone; in half a house owned in partnership with George Harwood, to whose wife and son he left his whole property, which was valued at only £26. A bear-skin and a chest are mentioned in the inventory, but no bed, table or chair. He had two cows and some other stock, plenty of land, decent apparel, a razor, a pewter porringer, three spoons and a glass bottle; but nothing else except tubs, trays, bags, and Indian baskets. This may be regarded as the inventory of a hermit of the woods—a settler of the simplest class, who had built a lodge in the thicket, on the outskirts of the plantation.

William Bartlett, died in 1658.

This person is sometimes called a ship-wright; and again a seaman. He was a lame man, engaged in the boating trade along the coast of the Sound. A deed is recorded, executed by him in March, 1658, but he soon after appears to us for the last time at Southold, L. I., in company with George Tongue, William Cooley, and his brother Robert Bartlett. He there traded with a Dutchman named Sanders Lennison, of whom he purchased a quantity of rum, in value £7, 10s., and paid for it in "*wompum and onions.*" In 1664 Lennison brought an action against Bartlett's estate for this sum, affirming that it had never been paid. From the depositions in this case and other circumstances, it is inferred that Bartlett died on the voyage, or soon

after reaching home. The date is not mentioned. He had probably no children, as his property passed into the hands of his widow and his brother Robert. In 1664 the former assigns all her interest in the estate to the latter in consideration of a "maintenance for six years past by his industrious care," and his engagement to provide for her future wants.¹ This intimates that she had been a widow during that time.

John Coit, died August 29th, 1659.

Mrs. Mary Coit died Jan. 2d, 1676, aged eighty. This may be regarded as almost a solitary instance of protracted widowhood for that day—our ancestors, at whatever age bereaved, having been much addicted to second and even third and fourth marriages. If the age of Mr. Coit equaled that of his wife, they were more advanced in years than most of the early settlers of the town; a couple—to be ranked with Jonathan Brewster and wife and Walter Harris and wife—for whose birth we look back into the shadow of the sixteenth century. The will of John Coit (Aug. 1st, 1659) provides for his son Joseph and two daughters, Mary and Martha; but he refers to four other children, two sons and two daughters *absent from him*, and leaves them a trifling legacy "in case they be living."

Of these four absent children, the only one that has been identified is John Coit the younger, who came to the plantation with his father in 1651 and had a house-lot laid out to him, but soon returned to Gloucester, where he fixed his residence. The other three children had perhaps been left in England. The two young daughters at New London, married John Stevens and Hugh Mould. Joseph, the youngest son of John Coit, is the ancestor of all the Connecticut stock of Coits, and perhaps of all who bear the name in the United States.² He married (July 13th, 1667) Martha, daughter of William Harris, of Windsor or Wethersfield—was chosen deacon of the church about 1680, and died March 27th, 1704.³ Joseph the second son of Joseph and Martha Coit, was the first native of New London

¹ In the above instrument she is called Susan Bartlett, but elsewhere Sarah. Her age, given in 1662, was seventy.

² An emigrant from New London planted the name in Saco, Maine, before the Revolution; others have since carried it to New York and the Western States.

³ Neither the date of his birth, nor his age at the time of his decease, has been ascertained.

that received a collegiate education. His name is on the first list of graduates of the seminary founded at Saybrook, which was the germ that expanded into Yale College; he took also a degree at Harvard University in 1704. Plainfield honors him as her first minister; and his descendants are supposed to be more numerous than any other branch of the family.

Jonathan Brewster, died in 1661.¹

No probate papers relating to his estate have been found; but bills of sale are recorded, dated in 1658, conveying all his property in the town plot, and his house and land at Poquetannuck,² with his movables, cattle and swine—"to wit 4 oxen, 12 cows, 8 yearlings and 20 swine," to his son, Benjamin Brewster, and his son-in-law John Picket. Feb. 14th, 1661-2, Mr. Picket relinquishes his interest in the assignment to his brother-in-law, stipulating only

"That my mother-in-law, Mrs. Brewster, the late wife of my father Mr. Jonathan Brewster, shall have a full and competent means out of his estate during her life, from the said B. B. at her own dispose freely and fully to command at her own pleasure."

The same trustees, Brewster and Picket, also conveyed certain lands to their sisters Grace and Hannah, but in the settlement of the estate, no allusion is made to other children.

Mrs. Lucretia Brewster, the wife of Jonathan, was evidently a woman of note and respectability among her compeers. She has always the prefix of honor (Mrs. or Mistress) and is usually presented to view in some useful capacity—an attendant upon the sick and dying as nurse, doctress, or midwife—or a witness to wills and other important transactions. She was one of the first band of pilgrims that arrived at Plymouth in the Mayflower, December, 1620, being a member of the family of her father-in-law, elder William Brewster, and having one child, William, with her.³ Her husband came over in the Fortune, which arrived Nov. 10th, 1621.⁴

¹ He was living in March, 1660-1. See Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 362.

² The orthography of this name is variable; that used in the text is perhaps the most prevalent, but Pocketannuck is nearest the pronunciation.

³ Shurtliff's list in Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol. 1, p. 50.

⁴ Davis on Morton's Memorial p. 278.

Jonathan Brewster settled first in Duxbury and was several times representative from that place. Subsequently he engaged in the coasting trade, and was master and probably owner of a small vessel plying from Plymouth along the coast to Virginia. In this way he became acquainted with Pequot Harbor, and entered the river to trade with the natives. In the spring of 1649 we find him overwhelmed with pecuniary disasters. Mr. Williams of Providence gives this notice of his misfortunes to Mr. Winthrop :

" Sir (though Mr. Brewster write me not word of it) yet in private I am bold to tell you that I hear it hath pleased God greatly to afflict him in the thorns of this life : He was intended for Virginia, his creditors in the Bay came to Portsmouth and unhung his rudder, carried him to the Bay where he was forced to make over house, land, cattle, and part with all to his chest. Oh how sweet is a dry morsel and an handful, with quietness from earth and Heaven."¹

At the time of this misfortune, Mr. Brewster was purposing a change of residence and probably removed to Mr. Winthrop's plantation as soon as he could arrange his affairs with his creditors. He was "Clarke of the Towne of Pequitt" in Sept., 1649. Part of his family came with him ; but several children remained behind. He had two sons, William and Jonathan, on the military roll in Duxbury, in 1643 ; the latter only sixteen years of age.² William was in the Narragansett war of 1645, after which his name is not found on the old colony records.³ Jonathan disappears from Duxbury about 1649, and it may be assumed that these two sons died without issue. Two daughters are traced in the old colony—Lucretia mentioned at the early date of 1627,⁴ and Mary, who married John Turner of Situate.

At New London we find one son and four daughters.

Benjamin, married, 1639, Anna Dart, and settled at Brewster's Neck, on the farm of his father.

Elizabeth, married, first, Peter Bradley, and second, Christopher Christopher. She was aged forty-two in 1680.

Ruth, married John Picket, probably about 1652.

Grace, married, August 4th, 1659, Daniel Wetherell.

Hannah, married, Dec. 25th, 1664, Samuel Starr. She was aged thirty-seven in 1680.

¹ Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 9, p. 281.

² Marcia Thomas, of Marshfield, (MS.)

³ *Ut supra.*

⁴ *Ut supra.*

Ezekiel Turner, a grandson of Mr. Brewster, from Situate, settled in New London, about the year 1675.

Richard Poole, died April 26th, 1662.¹

No grant to this person is on record, nor does he appear on any list of inhabitants, but his name is often mentioned. He is sometimes called *Mr. Poole*, and after his death is referred to as *old Poole*. He lived alone, near the union of what are now Ashcraft and Williams Streets. His estate, estimated at about £58, he left wholly to the wife and children of George Tongue.

Peter Bradley,² died in June, 1662.

The wife of Bradley was Elizabeth, daughter of Jonathan Brewster, but of the marriage, no record has been found. He was a mariner, and after his settlement in New London, plied a sloop or sail-boat through the Sound. His death is supposed to have occurred while absent on a cruise, as in the list of his effects is mentioned—"His boat and sea-clothing inventoried at Flushen." Between the families of Bradley and Christophers, three intermarriages took place.

Children of Peter and Elizabeth Bradley.

1. Elizabeth, b. March 16th, 1654-5. m. Sept. 22d, 1670, Thomas Dymond.
2. Peter b. Sept. 7th, 1658, m. Mary Christophers, May 9th, 1678.
3. Lucretia b. 1660. m. Jan. 16th, 1681-2, Richard Christophers. Elizabeth, relict of Peter Bradley, m. Christopher Christophers."

Peter Bradley, 2d, and his brother-in-law, Thomas Dymond, both died in 1687, as did also their father-in-law, Christopher Christophers. Bradley deceased August 1st, eight days after Mr. Christophers; leaving but one child, Christopher, born July 11th, 1679. The county court summarily settled the estate, giving to the widow, £300, and to the son, £590. Mary, relict of Peter Bradley, married Thomas Youngs, of Southold, and this event in the end transplanted the Bradley family to Long Island.

The Bradley lot, originally John Gallop's, lying east side of the Town Street, between the present State and Federal, and sloping

¹ Walter Palmer probably died about the same period, in Stonington. The probate action on his will was 11th of May. Savage, (MS.)

² This name, on the records, is frequently written *Braudley*; and sometimes *Bradley, alias Brasley*.

down to the marsh, where is now Water Street, was appraised in the inventory of Peter Bradley, 1st, at only £30. The Bradley house was near the north end, with a lane to it from the Town Street. In more recent times it was known as the Shackmaple house. North of it, and originally a piece of the lot, was the homestead of Daniel Wetherell, (where is now the Pool property.) Some other small portions were sold by Peter Bradley, 2d, but after his death it remained unimproved and integral, until 1730, when it was sold by Jonathan Bradley, of Southold, son of Christopher, deceased, to Daniel Tuthill, for £500. It was then called eight acres. Tuthill had it laid out in streets and blocks, and subdivided into small house-lots, which were put immediately into the market. There are now nearly two hundred buildings on this lot.

Thomas Dymond, who married Elizabeth Bradley, was a mariner from Fairfield, and probably brother of John Dymond, heretofore mentioned. He was a constable in 1679. His children were, Elizabeth, born 1672; Thomas, 1675; Moses, 1677; Ruth, 1680; John, 1686. The name and family passed away from New London. The house and wharf of Thomas Dymond, on Bream Cove, were purchased in 1702, by Benjamin Starr. The Dymond heirs continued to be proprietors of the Inner Commons till 1719.

William Redfield,¹ died in 1662.

The earliest notice of him is in a deed of gift from Jonathan Brewster, of "ten acres of arable land at Monhegan, whereon the said Redfyne hath built a house," (May 29th, 1654.) He had a son James, who in April, 1662, bound himself apprentice to Hugh Roberts, tanner, with consent, he says, of father and mother. Gershom Bulkley and Lucretia Brewster were witnesses of the indenture, being then probably in attendance upon the dying father. The widow Rebecca Redfield is often mentioned. She had two daughters, Rebecca, wife of Thomas Roach, and Judith, wife of Alexander Pygan. Thomas Bayley married, (Jan. 10th, 1655-6,) Lydia, daughter of James Redfield. It is probable that this was a sister of William.

James Redfield, probably the apprentice before-mentioned, is on the rate list of 1666, but his history from this point, is not clearly ascertained. A James Redfield married Elizabeth How, at New Haven, in 1669, and had a daughter, Elizabeth, born in 1670. A per-

¹ This name, on the early records, is often strangely corrupted into Redfin.

son of the same name, a weaver by trade, was a resident of Saybrook in 1676.¹ One or both of these may be identical with James, son of William, of New London; and as Redfield was not a very common name, it would not be strange if all the three might be reduced to one.

Sergeant Richard Hartley, died Aug. 7th, 1662.

The title of *Sergeant*, is derived from office held before he came to New London. He was an Englishman, and acted as agent to merchants in England, who consigned goods to him to sell. His will was written down from his mouth, Aug. 5th, "Witnesses, Gershom Bulkley, minister, Obadiah Bruen, Recorder, Lucretia Brewster, midwife, Wm. Hough, constable." His inventory amounted to £281, 6s. 9d.; one chest of his goods was afterward claimed by Thomas Reavell. He left his property to his wife and only child in England. In 1673, his house-lot, warehouse and wharf, were sold by James Avery, as attorney to Mary Wadsworth, formerly wife to Richard Hartley, and Martha Hartley, daughter of the same, both of Stanfield, in the county of York, England.

Isaac Willey, Jr., died in Aug., 1662.

He was a young man, probably not long married. His inventory, though slender, contains a few articles not very common, viz., "tynen pans; a tynen quart pot; cotton yarn," &c., together with one so common as to be almost universal—a *dram cup*, which appears in nearly every inventory for a century or more after the settlement.

Isaac Willey, Jr., left no children; his relict, Frances, married Clement Minor.

John Tinker, died at Hartford, in Oct., 1662.

The General Court ordered that the expenses of his sickness and funeral, amounting to £8, 6s. 4d., should be paid out of the public treasury.

"Children of John and Alice Tinker.

“ 1. Mary born 2 July 1653	4. Samuel born 1 April, 1659
“ 2. John “ 4 Aug 55	5. Rhoda “ 23 Feb. 1661-2.”
“ 3. Amos “ 28 Oct. 57	

Alice, relict of John Tinker, married, in 1664, Wm. Measure, a scrivener or attorney, who subsequently removed with the family to Lyme. Mr. Measure died during the administration of Sir Edmund Andross, and his inventory, dated July 27th, 1688, is recorded in Boston. His relict, Alice, died Nov. 20th, 1714, aged eighty-five years to a day.

Thomas Hungerford, died 1663.

Estate, £100. Children, three—"Thomas, aged about fifteen; Sarah, nine; Hannah, four years old, this first of May, 1663." The relict of Thomas Hungerford, married Samuel Spencer, of East Haddam; one of the daughters married Lewis Hughes, of Lyme.

On the road leading from New London to the Nahantick bar, (Rope Ferry) nearly in the parallel of Bruen's Neck, is a large single rock of granite, that in former times was popularly known as Hungerford's Fort. It is also mentioned on the proprietary records in describing the pathway to Bruen's Neck, as "the great rock called Hungerfort's Fort." We must refer to tradition for the origin of the name. It is said that a young daughter of the Hungerford family, (Hannah?) being alone on this road, on her way to school, found herself watched and pursued by a hungry wolf. He made his approaches cautiously, and she had time to secure some weapon of defense, and to retreat to this rock before he actually made his attack. And here she succeeded in beating him off, though he made several leaps up the rock, and his fearful bark almost bewildered her senses, till assistance came.

We can not account for the name and the tradition, without allowing that some strange incident occurred in connection with the rock, and that a wolf and a member of the Hungerford family were involved in it; but the above account may not be a correct version of the story.

Thomas Hungerford, 2d, had a grant of land in 1673, "four miles from town," and his name occurs, as an inhabitant, for ten or twelve years, though he was afterward of Lyme. The heroine of the rock is more likely to have been a member of his family, than of that of his father, whose residence was in the town plot, on the bank.

Robert Parke,¹ died 1665.

Mr. Parke was called *an aged man*, in 1662. His will is on the town book, dated May 14th, 1660; proved in March, 1664-5. He names only three children, William, Samuel and Thomas. Of the second son, Samuel, we have no information, except what may be inferred from the clause relating to him in the will. The oldest son, Deacon William Parke, of Roxbury, executor of the will, is directed to pay to Samuel, £50.

"Provided my said son Samuel, shall first come and demand the same in Roxbury within the time and space of seven years next and immediately after the date hereof."

Mr. Parke was of Wethersfield, in 1640, and made freeman of the colony in April, of that year. He was deputy to the General Court in Sept., 1641, and again in Sept., 1642;² but removed to Pequot in 1649; was a resident in the town plot about six years, and then established himself on the banks of the Mystic.

Thomas Parke, son of Robert, was also of Wethersfield, and had two children born there—Martha, in 1646, and Thomas, in 1648. His wife, Dorothy, is supposed to have been sister to Mrs. Blinman; the family name has not been recovered. Thomas Parke, after residing a number of years at Mystic, within the bounds of Stonington, removed with his son, Thomas Parke, Jr., to lands belonging to them in the northern part of New London, and, in 1680, they were both reckoned as inhabitants of the latter place. They were afterward included in Preston, and Thomas Parke, Sen., was the first deacon of Mr. Treat's church, organized in that town in 1698. He died July 30th, 1709. Beside the children before mentioned, he had sons, Robert, Nathaniel, William and John, and daughters, Alice and Dorothy, of whom no dates of birth have been found.³ Alice Parke became the wife of Greenfield Larrabee, (second of the name,) and Dorothy Parke, of Joseph Morgan.

¹ Often written Parks.

² Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 1, pp. 46, 66, 74.

³ The name of Alice Parke is found as a witness to deeds executed in 1658, which makes it probable that she was older than those born in Wethersfield, otherwise she could not have been more than eight or nine years of age. The law had not probably determined the age necessary to constitute a legal witness, but this was quite too young.

James Bemas, died in July, 1665.

This date is obtained by inference. James Bemas had been chosen constable for the year 1665 ; but on the 24th of July, Joseph Coit was appointed in his place, and his wife was soon after mentioned as the widow Bemas. She married in 1672 or 1673, Edward Griswold, of Killingworth. Two daughters of the widow Bemas were baptized in 1671, Rebecca and Mary ; but of the last-named, nothing further is known. Rebecca, daughter of James Bemas, married, April 3d, 1672, Tobias Minter, an emigrant from Newfoundland, and had a son Tobias born Feb. 26th, 1673-4. Her husband soon died, probably at sea, and she married, June 17th, 1674, John Dymond, another seaman, and had children, John, born in 1675, Sarah, in 1676, and Jonathan, 1678. The period of Dymond's death is not ascertained ; but the widow was united to a third sailor husband, as per record :

"Benedict Shatterly, son of William Shatterly of Devonshire, Old England, near Exon, was marryed unto Rebecca the widow of John Dymond, August 2, 1682."

Shatterly (or Satterly) is supposed to have died about 1689. He left two daughters, Sarah and Rebecca, and probably a son. Sarah Satterly married Joseph Wickham, of Killingworth. A late notice of Rebecca is obtained from Hempstead's Journal, under date of 1749. He is recording a visit that he had made to Long Island, and says :

"I called to see Joseph Sweezy and Rebekah his wife, formerly of Occubauk in Southold. She was a New London woman ; her maiden name was Satterly, born in an old house that belonged to her mother in old Mr. Coit's lot that joins to mine."

The Bemas house-lot, lying next to Robert Hempstead's, with a run of water between, was purchased of the heirs of John Coit, the deed of confirmation being signed by Tobias Minter, grandson of James Bemas, June 8th, 1694. It then comprised seven acres, and included the *hollow lot*, through which Cottage Street was opened in 1845, and a landing-place on the cove, where the old Bocage house now stands. Mr. Coit built a new house on the lot, which escaped the burning brand of the invader in 1781, and with the well-ordered grounds that surround it, still forms one of the choice homesteads of the town. The old Bemas house stood west of this, near the rivulet, with an orchard in the rear, upon the sloping land beneath the ledge of rocks. Of this orchard, one representative, an ancient apple-tree, is yet standing—a relic of a family that entirely passed away from the place, one hundred and sixty years ago. We can scarcely point

to any memorial of the founders of the town, more venerable than that apple-tree; and though it may not have been one of those nursery plants, of which it is said, Winthrop obtained a large number, and distributed as a bonus to the first settlers, there can be little doubt but that it was a fruit-bearing tree before 1700.¹



Ancient Apple Tree, on the ground of Jonathan Coit, Esq.

Andrew Longdon.

This person was an early settler in Wethersfield. He was on the jury of the Particular Court, at Hartford, in Sept., 1643.² In 1649, came to Pequot Harbor. In 1660, was appointed prison-keeper, and his house to be used as the town-prison. In July, 1665, Margaret, widow of Andrew Longdon, conveys her land, cattle and goods, to

1 The trunk of this apple-tree, measured a little above the surface of the ground, is fourteen or fifteen feet in circumference; the hollow within, about nine feet. Three or four persons can stand together in the trunk, which is a mere shell, although the tree has yet several thrifty limbs, which have blossomed profusely the present year, (1852.) It is several years since it has produced any fruit.

2 Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 92.

Wm. Douglas, on condition that he maintain her during life, give her a decent burial, and discharge her husband's debts. This is the only allusion to his death. The relict was living in 1667. No children are mentioned. The name is identical with Langdon.

William Chesebrough, died June 9th, 1667.

Though living at Pawkatuck, Mr. Chesebrough was chosen deputy from New London to the General Court, five times between 1653 and 1657. No fact shows more clearly the identity of the two settlements at that time. The name of Mr. Chesebrough's wife is said by family tradition to have been Deborah. No daughter is mentioned. He had five sons, Nathaniel, Elihu, Samuel, Elisha and Joseph. The last mentioned was born at Braintree, July 18th, 1640. This Joseph was probably the one that according to tradition died suddenly, soon after the removal of the family to Pawkatuck: It is said that one of the sons, a young lad, while mowing on the marsh, cut himself with the scythe so severely that he bled to death. He was interred on the banks of Wicketequack Creek, which flowed past their lonely residence. The spot thus early consecrated by receiving the dead into its bosom, became the common burial-ground of the family and the neighborhood. Here, undoubtedly, Mr. Chesebrough and all his sons were buried. Here, probably, lies the first Walter Palmer, in the midst of an untold throng of descendants. Here we may suppose Thomas Stanton to have been garnered, near the stones bearing the names of his sons Robert and Thomas. Here, also, were laid to rest the remains of Thomas Minor, and of his son, Deacon Manasseh Minor, the first-born male of New London. The Rev. Mr. James Noyes, Hallam, Searle, Thomson, Breed, and other ancients of Stonington, repose in this hallowed ground.

John Picket, died August 16th, 1667.

It is much to be regretted that a full record of the early marriages, which were undoubtedly by Mr. Winthrop, was not preserved. The marriage of John Picket and Ruth Brewster belongs to the unrecorded list. Their children were :

1. Mary, who married Benjamin Shapley.
2. Ruth, who married Mr. Moses Noyes, first minister of Lyme.
3. William, who died about 1690.
4. John, born July 25th, 1656.

5. Adam, born November 15th, 1658.

6. Mercy, born January 16th, 1660-1; married Samuel Fosdick.

Mr. Picket's estate was appraised at £1,140. This was sufficient to rank him, at that period, as one of the wealthiest merchants of the place.

Ruth, relict of John Picket, married, July 18th, 1668, Charles Hill.

The three sons of Mr. Picket died young, and at sea; two of them, and perhaps all, in the island of Barbadoes. John and William were unmarried.

Adam Picket married, May 16th, 1680, Hannah, daughter of Daniel Wetherell. He died in 1691, leaving two sons; Adam, born in 1681; John, in 1685. The former died in 1709, without issue, so that the family genealogy recommences with a unit.

The Picket house-lot, at the south-western extremity of the bank, descended nearly integral¹ to the fourth John Picket, among whose children it was divided, and sold by them in small house plots, between 1740 and 1750. Brewer Street was opened on the western border of this lot in 1745, and at first called Picket Street. John Picket, the fifth of the name, removed from New London, and with him, the male branch of the family passed away from the place. Descendants may be traced in the line of Peter Latimer, whose wife was Hannah Picket, and of Richard Christophers, who married Mary Picket, daughters of John Picket the fourth.

Andrew Lester died June 7th, 1669.

The births of four children of Andrew and Barbara Lester are recorded at Gloucester, viz.:

1. Daniel, born April 15th, 1642.	3. Mary, born December 26th, 1647.
2. Andrew, born Dec. 26th, 1644.	4. Anne, born March 21st, 1651.

Andrew Lester was licensed to keep a house of entertainment at Gloucester, by the county court, 26th of second month, 1648. He removed to Pequot in 1651; was constable and collector in 1668.

1 One exception must be made; a portion of the lot had been given by the first John Picket to his daughter, Mercy, the wife of Samuel Fosdick, by whom it was sold to William Rogers, and by him to George Denison, ship-wright of Westerly, and by the latter, in 1784, to Capt. Nathaniel Shaw. Capt. Shaw blasted away the rocks to obtain a convenient site, and out of the materials erected the stone house, now the residence of one of his descendants, N. S. Perkins, M. D. It has been enlarged by the present possessor, in the same way that it was first built—with materials uprooted from the foundation on which it stands.

His wife Barbara, died February 2d, 1653-4, the first death of a woman on record in the plantation. His second wife was Joanna, relict of Robert Hempstead, who died before 1660; no children mentioned. By a third wife, Ann, he had:

5. Timothy, born July 4th, 1662; 6. Joseph, born June 15th, 1664; 7. Benjamin. His relict married Isaac Willey. "Widow Anna Willey, sometime wife to Andrew Lester, Sen., deceased," died in 1692.

Sergeant Daniel Lester, oldest son of Andrew, lived upon the Great Neck, where he died January 16th, 1716-17. He was brought into town and buried under arms. Joseph and Benjamin Lester also settled on farms in the vicinity of the town plot. The descendants of the latter are very numerous. By his first wife, Ann Stedman, he had nine sons and two daughters, and probably other children by a second wife. No descendants of Timothy, son of Andrew Lester have been traced.

Andrew Lester, Jr., settled east of the river; was constable for that side in 1669, and is supposed to have been the first deacon of the Groton church. He died in 1708.

William Morton, died 1669,

A native of London and proud of his birthplace, it is probable that the influence of William Morton had something to do with the persevering determination of the inhabitants to call their plantation New London. He was the first proprietor of that sandy point over which Howard Street now runs to meet the new bridge to Mamacock. This was at first called Morton's Point; then Hog Neck, from the droves of swine that resorted thither to root up the clams at low tide; and afterward Windmill Point, from the structure erected upon it. It has also at various times borne the names of its owners, Fosdick, Howard, &c., and is now a part of the larger point known as Shaw's Neck.

On this point, the latter years of Mr. Morton's life were spent in comparative silence and poverty. In 1668, it is noted in the moderator's book, "Mr. Morton's town rate is remitted," and at the June session of the county court in 1669, the appointment of Mr. Wetherell to settle his estate, shows that he had deceased. The last remnant of this estate, consisting of a ten acre grant at Bachelor's Cove, in Groton, given to him by the town in 1650, was sold in 1695, to Waite Winthrop, Esq., and the deed confirmed by Morton's heirs:

" Nathaniel Randall, of Boston, baker, son and heir apparent to John Randall, late of the parish of St. James, Clerkenwell, Co. of Middlesex, London, silk-throster, deceased, and Elizabeth his wife, also deceased, who was sister and heir of William Mourton, late of New London, gentleman, deceased."

Mr. Morton must be added to the list of childless and lonely men to be found among the planters of New London. The two Bartletts, Collins, Cotter, Longdon, Loveland, Merritt, Morton, Poole, Roberts, left no descendants here, and several of them appear to have been unmarried.

Robert Latimer,¹ died about 1671.

This is ascertained from the proceedings on the settlement of the estate in 1693, when his relict Ann presented the inventory, and requested a legal distribution of the property of her husband, " who deceased twenty-two years since." Mrs. Ann Latimer had two children by her first husband, Matthew Jones, of Boston. These were Matthew and Sarah. The children of Robert and Ann Latimer were also two :

Robert, born February 5th, 1668-4; Elizabeth, born November 14th, 1667. The two sisters married brothers. Sarah Jones became the wife of John Prentis; Elizabeth Latimer, of Jonathan Prentis. Mrs. Latimer died in 1693, and the estate was divided among the four children, in nearly equal proportion. Matthew Jones, the son of Mrs. Latimer, was a sea-captain, sailing from Boston, and at no time appears as an inhabitant of New London. The Latimer homestead was on the Town Street and Winthrop's Cove, comprising the old Congregational parsonage, and the Edgar place opposite.

Capt. Robert Latimer, 2d, amassed a considerable estate in land. Beside the homestead in town, he purchased the Royce and Comstock lots, on Williams and Vauxhall Streets, covering the ridge of Post Hill. Westward of the town plot, he inherited a considerable tract of swamp and cedar land, on one portion of which Cedar Grove Cemetery was laid out in 1851, the land having to that time remained in the possession of his descendants. He owned likewise a farm at Black Point, and an unmeasured quantity of wild land in the woods, in what is now Chesterfield Society, in Montville.

No connection between the Latimers of New London and the early planter of this name in Wethersfield has been traced. It is most

¹ Usually in the earlier records written Lattemore.

probable that Robert Latimer, of New London, was an emigrant direct from England.

Edward Codner,¹ died 1671.

He appears to have been a mariner and trader; was of New London, 1651, with wife Priscilla; came from Saybrook; returned thither again, and there died, leaving a widow Alice. His possessions in New London accrued to his son, Laurence or Laurent, who was administrator of the estate. He left also a daughter.

Laurence Codner was an inhabitant before 1664. By his wife Sarah, he had three children, two of them sons, who died in infancy. His daughter Sarah married Thomas Bennet, of Mystic. The Codner homestead was on the Town Street, north of the present Huntington lane, and extending to the old burial ground. It was the original home-lot of Jarvis Mudge.

George Codner, of New London, 1662 and 1664, has not been further traced.

William Nicholls, died September 4th, 1673.

A person of this name, and probably the same man, had land given him in Salem, 1638.² He was an early and substantial settler at Pequot; often on committees, and sustaining both town and church offices. He married Ann, relict of Robert Isbell, but no allusion is made to children by this or any former wife. Widow Ann Nicholls died September 15th, 1689. Her two children, by her first husband, died before her, but she left four grandchildren, a son and daughter of Eleazer Isbell, and a son and daughter of Thomas Stedman.

George Tonge, died in 1674.

The early records have his name written Tongue, but the orthography used by himself is given above. In the will of Peter Collins, in 1655, Capt. James Tong is mentioned as a debtor to the estate. This person was not of New London, but he may have been brother of George, of whom nothing is known until he appears in New London about 1652. His marriage is not recorded.

1 Sometimes Codnall.

2 Felt, p. 169.

Children of George and Margery Tonge:

1. Elizabeth, born October 20th, 1652; married Fitz-John Winthrop.
2. Hannah, born July 20th, 1654; married Joshua Baker.
3. Mary, born September 17th, 1656; married John Wickwire.
4. George, born May 8th, 1658.

George Tonge was sixty-eight years of age in 1668. His wife was probably younger. Hempstead's diary mentions the death of "Goody Tongue," December 1st, 1713; this was undoubtedly his relict. No other family of the name appears among the inhabitants. The inn so long kept by George Tonge and his widow and heirs, stood on the bank between the present Pearl and Tilley Streets. Madam Winthrop inherited the house, and occupied it after the death of her husband. She sold portions of the lot to John Mayhew, Joseph Talman and others. A small, gray head-stone in the old burial ground bears the following inscription :

"HERE LYETH THE BODY
OF MADAM ELIZABETH
WINTHROP, WIFE OF
THE HONORABLE
GOVERNOR WINTHROP,
WHO DIED APRIL YE 25TH,
1731, IN HER 79TH YEAR."

George Tonge and his wife and children, as legatees of Richard Poole, inherited a considerable tract of land in the North Parish, which went into the Baker and Wickwire families. Pole's or Poole's Hill, which designates a reach of high forest land in Montville, is supposed to derive its name from Richard Poole. Of George Tonge the second, (born 1658,) no information whatever has been recovered; but we may assume with probability that he was the father of John Tongue, who married Anna Wheeler, November 21st, 1702, and had a numerous family of sons and daughters.

Thomas Bayley,¹ died about 1675.

Thomas Bayley married, January 10th, 1655-6, Lydia, daughter of James Redfield. The same month a grant was made to him by the townsmen, "with the advice and consent of Mr. Winthrop," of a lot lying north of Mr. Winthrop's land, upon the east side of the river. Relinquishing his house in the town plot, he settled on this grant,

¹ His descendants uniformly write the name Bailey.

which by subsequent additions expanded into a farm. His children were:

1. Mary, born February 14th, 1656-7; married Andrew Davis.
2. Thomas, born March 5th, 1658-9.
3. John, born in April, 1661.
4. William, born April 17th, 1664.
5. James, born September 26th, 1666.
6. Joseph.
7. Lydia.

Lydia, relict of Thomas Bayley, married in 1676, William Thorne, of Dorsetshire, old England.

William Keeny, died 1675.

He was aged sixty-one in 1662, and his wife Agnes (or Annis), sixty-three. His daughter Susannah, who married Ralph Parker, thirty-four; Mary, who married Samuel Beeby, twenty-two, and his son John, twenty-one. No other children are mentioned.

John Keeny, son of William, married in October, 1661, Sarah, daughter of William Douglas. They had daughter Susannah, born September 6th, 1662, who married Ezekiel Turner. No other child is recorded. The wife died August 4th, 1689. John Keeny was subsequently twice married, and had five daughters, and a son John; the latter born February 13th, 1700-1.

John Keeny died February 3d, 1716, on the Keeny land, at Nantucket, which has since been divided into three or four farms.

John Gallop.

He was the son of John Gallop, of Massachusetts, and both father and son were renowned as Indian fighters. Capt. John Gallop, of Stonington, was one of the six captains slain in the Narragansett fort fight, Dec. 19th, 1675. His wife was Hannah, daughter of Mrs. Margaret Lake. The division made of his estate by order of the county court, was, to the widow, £100; to the oldest son, John, £137; to Ben-Adam, £90; to William and Samuel, £89 each; to the five daughters, £70 each. No record of the births of these children has been recovered. The sons are supposed to be mentioned above in the order of age. Ben-Adam was born in 1655; William in 1658. The order in which the daughters should be placed is not known.

Hannah, married June 18th, 1672, Stephen Gifford, of Norwich.
 Christobel, married, 1677, Peter Creery, or Crary, of N. London, (Groton.)
 Elizabeth, married Henry Stevens, of Stonington.
 Mary, married John Cole, of Boston.
 Margaret, not married in 1704.

Joshua Raymond, died April 24th, 1676.

Richard and Judith *Rayment*, were members of the church at Salem, in 1634. Wm. Rayment, of Salem, 1648, afterward of Beverly, and John, also of Beverly, where he died in 1703, aged eighty-seven, were probably brothers of Richard. Tradition in the family of the latter, states that his brothers settled in Beverly. Richard and his sons appear to have left Salem as early as 1658, perhaps before, and to have scattered themselves along the shore of Long Island Sound. The father was for a time at Norwalk, and then at Saybrook; at the latter place his identity is determined by documents which style him, "formerly of Salem, and late of Norwalk." He died at Saybrook in 1692. He had children, Richard, John, Daniel, Samuel, Joshua, and a daughter, Elizabeth, who married Oliver Manwaring. Of *Richard*, nothing has been recovered but the fact that the inventory of Richard Raymond, Jr., was exhibited at county court in 1680.

John settled in Norwalk, and there left descendants.

Daniel married, first, Elizabeth, daughter of Gabriel Harris, and had two daughters, Elizabeth and Sarah; second, Rebecca, daughter of John Lay, by whom he had sons, Richard, Samuel, and perhaps others. He lived in Lyme; died, 1696, and his widow married Samuel Gager, of Norwich.

Samuel married Mary, daughter of Nehemiah Smith, and settled in New London, where they both died after 1700, leaving a considerable estate, but no children.

Joshua, married Elizabeth, daughter of Nehemiah Smith, Dec. 10th, 1659. He purchased the Prentis home-lot, in New London, and left it to his children, together with a valuable farm in Mohegan, on the road to Norwich.

Children of Joshua and Elizabeth Raymond.

1. Joshua, born Sept. 18th, 1660. 4. Hannah, born Aug. 8th, 1665.
2. Elizabeth, " May 24th, 1662. 5. Mary, " March 12th, 1671-2.
3. Ann, " May 12th, 1664. 6. Experience, " Jan. 20th, 1673-4.

Two others, Richard and Mehitable, died in infancy.

Experience Raymond, died June 20th, 1699, aged fifteen years.

Elizabeth, relict of Joshua Raymond, married George Dennis, of Long Island.

Joshua Raymond, second, married Mercy, daughter of James Sands, of Block Island, April 29th, 1683.

It is this Mercy Raymond, whose name has been connected, by a mixture of truth and fable, with the story of the noted pirate, Captain Kidd.¹ Mr. Raymond died in 1704, "at the home-seat of the Sands family," which he had bought of his brother-in-law, Niles, on Block Island. It was a lonely and exposed situation, by the sea-shore, with a landing-place near, where strange sea-craft, as well as neighboring coasters, often touched. Here the family dwelt, and Mr. Raymond being much of the time absent in New London, the care and management of the homestead devolved upon his wife, who is represented as a woman of great thrift and energy.

The legendary tale is, that Capt. Kidd made her little harbor his anchorage-ground, alternately with Gardiner's Bay; that she feasted him, supplied him with provisions, and boarded a strange lady, whom he called his wife, a considerable time; and that when he was ready to depart, he bade her hold out her apron, which she did, and he threw in handfuls of gold, jewels and other precious commodities, until it was full, as the wages of her hospitality.

This fanciful story was doubtless the development of a simple fact, that Kidd landed upon her farm, and she being solitary and unprotected, took the part of prudence, supplied him freely with what he would otherwise have taken by force, and received his money in payment for her accommodations. The Kidd story, however, became a source of pleasantry and gossip among the acquaintances of the family, and they were popularly said to have been *enriched by the apron*.²

Robert Royce, died in 1676.

This name is identical with *Rice*. The Robert Royce, of New London, is presumed to be the Robert *Rice* who was entered freeman in Mass., 1634, and one of those disarmed in Boston, 1637, for adherence to the opinions and party of Wheelright and Hutchinson.³ When he left Boston is not known; but he is found at Stratford, west of New Haven, before 1650,⁴ and was there in 1656. In 1657

1 He is called *Robert Kidd* in the ballad; but *William* in history.

2 Our language does not form a cognomen so terse as the Latin: the posterity of Callias were called *lacco-pluti*, *enriched by the well*. (See Plutarch.)

3 Savage, on Winthrop, vol. 1, p. 248.

4 Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

he came to New London, and the town granted him the original Post lot, on Post Hill. He was by trade a shoemaker, was constable in 1660, one of the townsmen in 1663, in 1667 appointed to keep an ordinary, and the same year, "freed from training," probably on account of age. He was again townsmen in 1668.

Three children of Robert and Elizabeth Rice are recorded in Boston; Joshua, born 1637; Nathaniel, 1639, and a daughter that died in infancy.¹ Of Joshua, nothing further is known. At New London, we find mementos of five sons and three daughters. Jonathan was perhaps the oldest son; he married in June, 1660, Deborah, daughter of Hugh Caulkins, and removed to Norwich, of which town he was one of the first proprietors. Nehemiah may be ranked, by supposition, as the second son; he married, Nov. 20th, 1660, Hannah, daughter of James Morgan. In 1668, Robert Royce petitioned the town for a grant of land to settle his two sons, Samuel and Nathaniel. This was granted; their father gave them also his mountain farm, "bought of Weaver Smith, and lying west of Alewife Brook, by the mountain." The name of Royce's Mountain was long retained in that locality. The Royce Mountain farm was purchased by John and Wait Winthrop, in 1691—the present Miller farm is a part of it.

Samuel Royce married, Jan. 9th, 1666-7, Hannah, daughter of Josiah Churchwood, of Wethersfield.

Isaac Royce was married to Elizabeth, daughter of Samuel Lothrop, and John Lothrop was married to Ruth, daughter of Isaac Royce, Dec. 15th, 1669. This double marriage was performed by Daniel Wetherell, commissioner, and probably in the court-room, as it was recorded among the other proceedings of the court. Marriages were sometimes conducted in that manner; the couple entering the room with their friends, and arranging themselves in front of the bench.

Nehemiah, Samuel, Nathaniel and Isaac Royce, all removed with their families to Wallingford, a township that had been recently set off from New Haven, and previously called New Haven village. The marriage and children of Nathaniel Royce are not registered in New London. At a late period of his life, he married the relict of Sergeant Peter Farnham, of Killingworth, and was living at Wallingford in 1712.² None of the Royce family was left at New London,

¹ Records of Boston.

² Sergeant Farnham died in 1704; the maiden name of his wife was Wilcoxson.

after the death of Robert, but his aged widow, who, in 1688, was still an occupant of the Post Hill homestead, which was subsequently sold to John Prentis. The remainder of the Royce land was purchased by Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall, and has of late been known as the Mumford lot. It lies west of the old burial-ground, and was the original house-lot of Rev. Richard Blinman.

Jacob Waterhouse, died 1676.

The date is obtained from the probate of his will, which was in September, of this year. He was probably an old man, as all his children were of age, and he was released from militia duty in 1665. His wife was Hannah, and his oldest sons, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; but the order of their age was not patriarchal, Isaac being repeatedly called the oldest son. He had also sons, John, Joseph and Benjamin; and a daughter, Elizabeth, who married John Baker. Isaac settled in Lyme; Abraham in Saybrook; Joseph and Benjamin died without issue; the latter at sea, and according to tradition, at the hands of pirates. John was a soldier in Philip's War, and present at the Narragansett fort fight, in December, 1676. He died in 1687, leaving an infant son, Jacob, and no other child. His relict, whose maiden name is not recovered, married John Hayden, of Saybrook.

Jacob, married, about 1690, Ann, daughter of Robert Douglas, and had sons, John, William, Robert, Joseph and Gideon, but no daughters have been traced.

The name Waterhouse was very soon abbreviated into Watrous, which is the orthography now generally used.

John Lewis, died Dec. 8th, 1676.

The name John Lewis, is found several times repeated among the early emigrants to New England. One came over in the Hercules, from Sandwich, in 1635, with wife, Sarah, and one child; and was enrolled as from Tenterden, in Kent.¹ This is probably the same that appears on the list of freemen in Scituate, Mass., 1637.² He

¹ Savage. *Gleanings in Mass. Hist. Coll.*, 3d series, vol. 8, p. 275.

² Deane's *Hist. Scituate*, p. 304.

afterward disappears from the records of that town, and we suppose him to be the John Lewis, who came to New London, 1648.

Another John Lewis, who was probably an original emigrant, settled in Saybrook or Lyme; his inventory was presented at the county court, in 1670.

Still another John Lewis was living at "Squummacutt," (Westerly) in 1673.

John Lewis, of New London, had a son John, who was a young man in 1670, constable in 1681, and after 1700, sergeant of the train-bands. He married Elizabeth Huntley, of Lyme, where his oldest son, John 3d, settled. Sergeant John Lewis was himself instantly killed, as he sat on horseback, by the sudden fall of the limb of a tree, which men were cutting, May 9th, 1717.

Nathaniel and Joseph Lewis, are names that appear on the rate-list of 1667, as partners in estate. They were transient residents, and probably sons of George Lewis, of Scituate,¹ brother of John, the freeman of 1637. If the latter, as we have supposed, was identical with John Lewis, of New London, these young men were his nephews.

Thomas Stanton, of Stonington, died 1678.

The probate of his will was in June, of that year. In a list of passengers registered in England to sail for Virginia, in 1635, is found the name of Thomas Stanton, aged twenty.² If this was our Thomas Stanton, of Connecticut, which can scarcely be doubted, he must soon have made his way to New England, and have become rapidly an adept in the Indian language. He testified himself, before the court of commissioners of New England, that he had acted as interpreter to Winthrop, before the Pequot war, and while the latter was in command at Saybrook, (1636.) It is probable, that on landing in Virginia, he went immediately among the Indians, and gained some knowledge of their language, which was radically the same as that of the New England tribes, and having, perhaps, obtained a quantity of peltries, he came north with them, and made his first stop at Saybrook. That Stanton subsequently visited the Indians in Virginia, for the purposes of trade, may be gathered from a curious fragment in the New London county records, which is without date, but appears to have been entered in 1668 or 1669.

¹ Deane, p. 308.

² Hist. and Gen. Register, vol. 2, p. 118.

"Whereas Capt. Wm. Morrice hath reported and informed the Kings' Commissioner that Mr. Thomas Stanton, Senr, did, in Virginia, some 20 odd years since, cause a massacre among the Indians, whereby to gain their Beaver to himself, and the said Morrice accused Richard Arye, mariner, to be his author: These may certify all whom it may concern that the said Arey being examined concerning [a word or two torn off] report, doth absolutely deny that he knew or reported any such thing [torn off] Morrice nor ever heard of any such thing [torn off] Mr. Stanton in Virginia to his remembrance. This was acknowledged in Court by Richard Arey, as attest Daniel Wetherell, *Recorder.*"

The services of Mr. Stanton as interpreter during the Pequot War were invaluable. He was moreover a man of trust and intelligence, and his knowledge of the country and of the natives made him a useful pioneer and counselor in all land questions, as well as in all difficulties with the Indians.

In 1638, the General Court of Connecticut appointed him a stated Indian interpreter, with a salary of £10 per annum. He was to attend courts upon all occasions, general and particular courts, and meetings of magistrates, wherever and whenever the controversy was between whites and Indians.

Mrs. Anna Stanton, relict of Thomas, died in 1688. She had lived several years in the family of her son-in-law, Rev. James Noyes. The children of Thomas Stanton can be ascertained only by inference and comparison of circumstances. The following list is the result of considerable investigation, and may be nearly correct.

1. Thomas, died in 1718, aged eighty. He had a son, Thomas, 3d, who died in 1683, aged eighteen.
2. John, died October 3d, 1713, aged seventy-two.
3. Mary, married November 17th, 1662, Samuel Rogers.
4. Hannah, married November 20th, 1662, Nehemiah Palmer.
5. Joseph, baptized in Hartford, March 21st, 1646.
6. Daniel, died before 1688, and it is supposed in Barbadoes, leaving there a wife and one child¹
7. Dorothy, married Rev. James Noyes; died in 1742, in her ninety-first year.
8. Robert, died in 1724, aged seventy-one.
9. Sarah, married William Denison; died in 1713, aged fifty-nine. All these were living in 1711, except Sarah and Daniel.

Matthew Waller, died in 1680.

Of this person little is known. He was perhaps the Matthew Waller, of Salem, 1637, and the Sarah Waller, member of Salem

1 Mrs. Anna Stanton, relict of Thomas, left a legacy "to the fatherless child in Barbadoes," without mentioning its name or parentage.

church, in 1648,¹ may have been his wife. He had two daughters, Rebecca and Sarah, who owned the covenant and were baptized in 1671. Rebecca married Thomas Bolles and died in 1712, leaving no issue. Sarah was unmarried in 1699.

Ensign William Waller, of Lyme, was brother of Matthew. One of his sons, Samuel Waller, lived on a farm at Niantick, within the bounds of New London, where he died in 1742, very aged.

Matthew Beckwith,² died December 13th, 1681.

His death being sudden and the result of accident, a jury was summoned, who gave their verdict, that "he came to his death by mistaking his way in a dark night, and falling from a clift of rocks." Estate £393. He left wife Elizabeth, and children, Matthew, John, Joseph, Benjamin, and two daughters, widows, the relicts of Robert Gerard³ and Benjamin Grant, both of whom were mariners, and had probably perished at sea.⁴ No other children are mentioned in the brief record of the settlement of the estate; but Nathaniel Beckwith, of Lyme, may upon supposition, be included among his sons.

Matthew Beckwith, Jun., like his father, and most of the family, was a seaman. The births of his two oldest children, Matthew and John, are registered in Guilford, where he probably married and resided for a time. The next three, James, Jonah and Prudence, are on record in New London; and three more, Elizabeth, Ruth and Sarah, in Lyme, where he fixed his abode in 1677. These were by his first wife. His second wife was Elizabeth, relict of Peter Pratt, by whom he had one daughter, named *Griswold*. All these children are named in his will except Sarah. He died June 4th, 1727.

Joseph and Nathaniel Beckwith, sons of Matthew, Sen., settled in Lyme; John and Benjamin, in New London. John Beckwith, in a deposition presented in county court in 1740, stated that he had lived for seventy years near Niantick ferry. He is the ancestor of the Waterford family of Beckwiths.

¹ Felt's Salem, pp. 170, 175.

² This name is written also Beckworth and Becket.

³ Frequently written Jarret.

⁴ Benjamin Grant died in 1670. He was a son of Christopher Grant, of Watertown or Cambridge, and left a son Benjamin, who in 1693, was of Cambridge.

Richard Haughton, died in 1682.

This event took place at Wethersfield, while Mr. Haughton was engaged at work, as a shipwright, on a vessel there. Of his children no regular list has been obtained. Massapeag Neck, a fine tract of land on the river, within the bounds of Mohegan proper, was granted to Haughton by deed of the sachem Uncas, August 19th, 1658. The laws of the colony prohibited individuals from contracting with the Indians for land; nevertheless the General Court confirmed this grant, upon certain conditions, assigning as one reason for their indulgence to Mr. Haughton, "his charge of children." We infer from this that he had a young and numerous family. Eight children can be traced; of whom three sons, Robert, Joseph and John, are supposed to belong to a first unknown wife, dating their birth anterior to the settlement of the family at New London.¹ Robert's name occurs as a witness in 1655. In 1675 he was a resident in Boston, a mariner, and in command of a vessel. He was afterward at Milford, where he died about the year 1678, leaving three children, Robert, Sarah and Hannah.² His relict married Benjamin Smith, of Milford. The daughter, Sarah, married Daniel Northrop, and in 1735 was apparently the only surviving heir to certain divisions of land accruing to her father from the family rights in New London.

Joseph Haughton was twenty-three years of age in 1662. He died in 1697, and apparently left no family.

John Haughton, shipwright, died in 1704, leaving wife and children.

The wife that Richard Haughton brought with him to New London, was Katherine, formerly wife to Nicholas Charlet or Chelet, whom he had recently married. She had two daughters by her former husband, Elizabeth (born July 15th, 1645) and Mary, whose joint portion was £100.³ The remainder of Richard Haughton's children may be assigned to this wife, viz., sons Sampson and James and three daughters—Abigail, married Thomas Leach; Katherine, married John Butler; and Mercy, married Samuel Bill. Katherine, wife of Richard Haughton, died August 9th, 1670. He afterward

¹ The name of Richard Haughton is found in 1646, among the settlers in Milford. Lambert's New Haven Colony, p. 91.

² Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

³ They had the note and surety of their father-in-law for this sum, which in 1663 was indorsed by Elizabeth Charlet, *satisfied*. This was probably the period of her marriage.

married Alice ——, who survived him and became the wife of Daniel Crombe, of Westerly.

Massapeag Neck was sold by the Haughton heirs to Fitz-John Winthrop. Sampson Haughton, the ancestor of the Montville branch of the family, in 1746, settled in the neighborhood of Massapeag, on a farm which he purchased of Godfrey Malbone, of Newport, lying on both sides of the country road between New London and Norwich. Haughton's farm became a noted halfway station between the two places.

William Douglas, died July 26th, 1682.

He was of Ipswich, 1641;¹ of Boston, 1645; made freeman of Mass., 1646;² of New London, December, 1659. From various depositions it appears that he was born in 1610; his wife was about the same age.³ Her maiden name was Ann Mattle; she was daughter of Thomas, and sister of Robert Mattle, of Ringstead, in Northamptonshire; both of whom had deceased before 1670, leaving property to which she was the legal heir.⁴

Their children were Robert, born about 1639; William, born in Boston, May 2d, 1645;⁵ Anna, wife of Nathaniel Gary; Elizabeth, wife of John Chandler,⁶ and Susannah, who came with her parents to New London, and married in October, 1661, John Keeny.

Mr. Douglas was one of the townsmen in 1663, 1666 and 1667; recorder and moderator in 1668; sealer and packer in 1673; and on various important committees, civil and ecclesiastical, from year to year. He had a farm granted him in 1660, "three miles or more west of the town plot, with a brook running through it;" and another in 1667, "towards the head of the brook called Jordan, about four miles from town, on each side of the Indian path to Nahantick." These farms were inherited by his sons, and are still in the possession of their descendants.

William Douglas, Sen., and wife, with his two sons and their wives, and his daughter, Keeny, were all members of Mr. Bradstreet's church, in 1672. Robert Douglas married, September 28th, 1665,

¹ Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol. 2, p. 175.

² Savage's Winthrop, vol. 2, p. 874.

³ He was sixty-five in 1676; his wife sixty in 1670.

⁴ Depositions taken before Gov. Bellingham, of Mass., on record in New London.

⁵ Boston Records.

⁶ Lincoln's Hist. Worcester, p. 275.

Mary, daughter of Robert Hempstead; the first-born of New London. William Douglas, 2d, held the office of deacon in the church at New London, about thirty years. He married, December 18th, 1667, Abiah, daughter of William Hough. His oldest son, William, removed to Plainfield, and was one of the first deacons of the church in that place. He is the ancestor of the Douglas families of Plainfield.

No family among the early settlers of the town has sent more colonies to other parts of the Union than that of Douglas. The descendants of William, 1st, are widely dispersed through New York, and

- the states farther west, and also in some of the southern states. He and his immediate family wrote the name Douglas, with one *s*; Douglass is a variation of later times.

[The Chandlers, of Woodstock, were connected with New London by so many ties, that a short digression respecting them may not be amiss. John Chandler, son of William, of Roxbury, Mass., removed with a company from Roxbury, to a place then regarded as a portion of Worcester county, Mass., and called New Roxbury. It was afterward named Woodstock, and included in Connecticut, forming a part of New London county.¹ This John Chandler, second of the name in this country, was the one who married Elizabeth, daughter of William Douglas. His oldest son, John, married Mary, daughter of Joshua Raymond, of New London, and resided several years in the place. The births of his first four children, John, Joshua, William and Mary, are recorded here. The family afterward returned to Woodstock, but the third John, agreeably to the custom of his ancestors, came down to the salt water for a wife, and married, about 1718, Hannah, daughter of John Gardiner, of the Isle of Wight. He also resided for a short period in New London, and the fourth John Chandler, in lineal succession, was born here, February 26th, 1720.]

Robert Burrows,² died in August, 1682.

Robert Burrows married in Wethersfield about the year 1645, Mary, relict of Samuel Ireland.³ She had two daughters by her

1 Now in Windham county.

2 This name is now generally written Burroughs or Burrough.

3 Ireland came to America in 1635. "Samuel Ireland, carpenter aged thirty-two, Uxor, thirty—Martha, one and a half." Sav. Gleanings, p. 261.

first husband, Martha and Mary, whose portion of £30 each was delivered to their father-in-law, Burrows, by John Latimer of Wethersfield, Oct. 20th, 1651. For the faithful performance of his trust, Burrows pledged his house, land and stock at Pequonock, which shows how early he had settled east of the river. Mary, wife of Robert Burrows, died in Dec., 1672. Only two children have been traced: Samuel and John, both presented to be made freemen of the colony in October, 1669. The subsequent history of Samuel is not known. John married, Dec. 14th, 1670, Hannah daughter of Edward Culver, and had a large family of children. He died in 1699.

Amos Richardson, of Stonington, died Aug. 5th, 1683.

Mary, his relict, survived him but a few weeks. John, the oldest son of Mr. Richardson, was minister of the church in Newbury, Mass., where he was settled in 1674. He had two other sons, Stephen and Samuel, and a daughter, Prudence, who married, first, March 15th, 1682-3, John Hallam; second, March 17th, 1702-3, Elathan Miner.

A lingering lawsuit was sustained by Mr. Richardson for several years against the town of New London to obtain possession of a house lot, formerly granted him, which, comprising the greater portion of the Parade, (State St.,) had been assumed by the town for a highway and public square. Mr. John Plumbe was Richardson's attorney. It was at last decided that Richardson should be indemnified for his lot, out of the nearest unoccupied land that the town owned. In execution of this judgment the marshal took four pieces; one piece of ninety-six rods, being a part of the original lot and on the north side of it, the same on which the first Episcopal church was afterward erected; a lot at the corner of Main and State Streets, west side,¹ which had hitherto been left common and uninclosed; ten rods on Mill Cove, and one hundred rods on the Beach.

“These two last pieces (says the marshal's return) were prized according to law, on the Cove, one rod for two, and on the Beach, two rods for one; the four pieces containing 285 rods were delivered to Mr. Amos Richardson and accepted in full satisfaction; Feb. 13, 1681.”

William Hough, died August 10th, 1683.

The family of Samuel Hough, oldest son of William, is registered

¹ This lot was assigned to Mr. Plumbe for his services in managing the case.

at Saybrook, and in connection with the record it is stated that William Hough, was a son of Edward Hough, of West Chester in Cheshire, England. It has not been ascertained that this Edward Hough emigrated to America, but a widow Ann Hough that died in Gloucester, Mass., in 1672, aged eighty-five years, was perhaps his relict, and the mother of William Hough.

William Hough married Sarah, daughter of Hugh Calkin, October 28th, 1635.

Children.

1. Hannah b. July 31, 1646.	6. William b. Oct. 13, 1657.
2. Abiah " Sept. 15, 1648.	7. Jonathan " Feb. 7, 1659-60.
3. Sarah " Mar. 23, 1651.	8. Deborah " Oct. 21, 1662.
4. Samuel " Mar. 9, 1652-3.	9. Abigail " Mar. 5, 1665-6.
5. John " Oct. 17, 1655.	10. Anna " Aug. 29, 1667.

Hannah Hough married John Borden of Lyme; Abiah married the second William Douglas; Sarah married David Carpenter.

The marriage of William Hough and the births of three children, are recorded at Gloucester; the remainder in New London, but it is mentioned that Samuel was born in Saybrook. The father being a house builder might have been temporarily employed in that place.

The last four children of William Hough are not afterward found at New London; it is probable that they were scattered in other towns. Samuel the oldest son settled in Saybrook. Capt. John Hough, the second son, was a noted man of his time, powerful in frame and energetic in character. His wife was Sarah Post, of Norwich, and Capt. Hough was at one time a resident in that place. His death was caused by a fall from the scaffolding of a house which he was building in New London, August 26th, 1715.¹ No external injury could be discovered, but he lived only an hour. Such an event was sufficient at that time to move the whole town.

William Hough, Jun., married Ann, daughter of Samuel Lothrop, of Norwich. He died April 22d, 1705. His relict, Widow Ann Hough, died in Norwich Nov. 19th, 1745.

John Baldwin, of Stonington, died August 19th, 1683.

Among the original emigrants from Great Britain to the shores of New England, were several John Baldwins. Two of these, father

¹ This house, which belonged to Richard Christophers, was on State Street, the end to the street, near the corner of the present Bradley Street, but at that time no street was opened east of it, and the house fronted the water. Capt. Hough fell from the south-east corner, on the spot now occupied by W. H. Chapman, merchant.

and son, who married Mary and Hannah Bruen, have already been mentioned in this history, as belonging to Milford, and subsequently joining the company that purchased Newark. Another John Baldwin was of Guilford, where he married Hannah Burchet, or Birchard, in 1658, and afterward removed to Norwich. A fourth John Baldwin was the one now under consideration, and may be distinguished as the son of Sylvester, of whom John, Sen., of Milford, was probably a brother.

Sylvester Baldwin died on the voyage from Great Britain, a passenger in the *Martin*, 1638, making his will "on the main ocean bound for New England." In this will he is said to be of Aston-Clinton in Bucks; he notes wife Sarah, sons Richard and John, and daughters Sarah, Mary, Martha and Ruth. The will was proved in July, before Deputy Governor Dudley of Mass.¹

In 1643, the Widow Baldwin is found enrolled among the residents of New Haven; five in her family and her estate estimated at £800.² She afterward married John Astwood, one of the first planters of Milford, and removed to that place.³ Richard Baldwin, her oldest son, married and settled at Milford. John, the second son, we suppose to be the person who came to New London, where his name appears occasionally after 1654, but not as a fixed resident till about ten years later.

He is on the rate list of 1667, and on the roll of freemen in 1668. He purchased two houses in the town plot and had several grants of land.

His first wife died at Milford in 1658, leaving a son, John, born in 1657.⁴ This son came to New London with him, received adult baptism in 1674 and after that event is lost to our records. From some probate testimony given at a much later period, we learn that soon after arriving at maturity, he sailed for England and never returned.⁵

John Baldwin, the father, married July 24th, 1672, Rebecca, relict of Elisha Chesebrough, and daughter of Walter Palmer. This connection with a richly dowried widow, whose possessions lay in Stonington, led to an immediate transfer of his residence to that

¹ Savage (MS.)

² Lambert's Hist. New Haven Colony, p. 54.

³ R. Smith, Esq., of Guilford, (MS.)

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

place. By this marriage he had a son Sylvester and several daughters.

Benjamin Atwell, died 1683.

The name suggests a family connection with the Benjamin Atwell killed by the Indians, while he was engaged in hay-making, August 11th, 1676, at Casco, within a mile of the present Portland, Maine.¹ Benjamin Atwell of New London, had been at that time about ten years an inhabitant. He was constable of the town in 1675. He had a son Benjamin, whose birth is not recorded in New London; Thomas born 1670; John, 1675; Joseph, 1677; Richard, 1679; and Samuel, the youngest child, born April 23d, 1682. Joseph, Richard and Samuel, settled about 1710, on wild land in the North Parish of New London. Joseph died without issue. Descendants of the others remain in that vicinity.

Two of the grandchildren of Samuel, that is, of the fourth generation from the first settler Benjamin, were living at the commencement of the year 1850. These were Samuel Atwell and his sister Lucretia, children of Samuel Atwell second. Samuel died Nov. 26th, 1850, aged ninety-five years and six months; Lucretia, daughter of Samuel second and relict of Joseph Atwell, died Oct. 25th, 1851, aged 102 years. She was born Nov. 19th, 1749, O. S. Here are three generations covering the space from 1682 to 1851.

Benjamin and Thomas Atwell, the two oldest sons of Benjamin senior, died in New London leaving descendants. John, in 1712, was of Saybrook.

Daniel Comstock, died 1683.

William Comstock the father of Daniel, came from Hartford in 1649 and lived to old age in his house upon Post Hill; (near north corner of Williams and Vauxhall Streets.) His wife Elizabeth was aged fifty-five in 1663. No record has been found of the death of either. His land was inherited by his son Daniel, of New London, and grandson William, of Lyme. The latter was a son of John Comstock deceased—and his mother Abigail in 1680, was the wife of Moses Huntley, of Lyme. It is probable that Daniel and John were the only children of William Comstock, sen., and his wife

¹ Willis' Hist. of Portland, pp. 134, 144.

Elizabeth. John is the ancestor of the Lyme family of Comstocks, and Daniel of those of the North Parish or Montville. The latter, as appears from statements of his age, was born about 1630. His wife, whose name was Paltiah, was a daughter, or step-daughter of John Elderkin. They had a son Daniel and eight daughters, whose births are not recorded; but they were all baptized by Mr. Bradstreet in April and November, 1671. After this two other sons were baptized; Kingsland in 1678, and Samuel in 1677.

John Lockwood, died in 1683.

We suppose this person to have been the son of Elizabeth, wife of Cary Latham, by a former husband Edward Lockwood, and the same whose birth stands on record in Boston, 9th month, 1632.¹ He dwelt on Foxen's Hill, at a place since known as a Wheeler homestead. In the settlement of the estate, no heir appears but Edmund Lockwood of Stamford, who is called his brother.

Ralph Parker, died in 1683.

He had a house in Gloucester in 1647. Sold out there "24th of 8 m. 1651" and was the same year a grantee at New London. He appears to have been wholly engaged in marine affairs—sending out vessels and sometimes going himself to sea. No births, marriages or deaths of his family are recorded. It is ascertained, however, that his wife was Susannah, daughter of Wm. Keeny; though not probably his first wife, as her age in October, 1662, was thirty-four and that of his daughter Mary nineteen. This daughter Mary married William Condy of Boston, about 1663: another daughter, Susannah, married Thomas Forster in 1666. Keeny, Condy, Forster and Parker were all masters of vessels, as was also at a later period, Jonathan Parker, son of Ralph. In the year 1710 Thomas Parker of Boston, son of Jonathan, was the principal heir to certain estate of the family left in New London.

Edmund Fanning, died in December, 1683.

It has been transmitted from one generation to another in the Fanning family that their ancestor "Edmund Fanning, escaped from

¹ Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol. 2, p. 181. and vol. 4, p. 181.

Dublin in 1641, in the time of the great rebellion, in which 100,000 Protestants fell victims to the fury of the Roman Catholicks,"¹ and after eleven years of wandering and uncertainty he found a resting place in that part of New London now called Groton, in the year 1652. On the town records the name is not mentioned till ten years later, but it is then in a way that denotes previous residence. In the inventory of goods of Richard Poole, April 25th, 1662, one article is—

“Two cowes and one steere now with Edmon ffaning.”

After this he has a grant of land; claims the bounty for killing a wolf; is chosen to some town office; is propounded to be made a freeman in Stonington, and thus occasionally gleams upon us, till we come to the last item—the probate of his estate.

Feb., 1683-4, “The widow Fanning is to pay 10 shillings for the settlement of her estate, it being done at a called Court, which the clerk is to demand and receive.”

The estate was distributed to the widow and four sons—Edmund, John, Thomas and William, and two grandsons, William and Benjamin Hewet.

Several of the family have in latter days been eminent as navigators;² others have gained distinction in naval battles and in military affairs.³

Charles Hill, died in October, 1684.

The first copartnership in trading at New London, of which we have any knowledge, is that of Hill and Christophers, “Charles Hill, of London, guilder, and Christopher Christophers, mariner.” The earliest date respecting them is June 26th, 1665, when they pur-

1 MS. information from late Capt. John Fanning, of Norwich.

2 In 1797, '98 and '99, Capt. Edmund Fanning, of Stonington, made a voyage for seals in the ship *Betsey*, in which he discovered several islands near the equator, not before laid down on any chart. They are known as Fanning's Islands. (See Fanning's *Voyages round the World*.)

3 Nathaniel Fanning, brother of Edmund, the discoverer, was an officer in the ship of Paul Jones at the time of his celebrated naval battle, and by his gallant daring contributed essentially to the brilliant result. He was stationed in the maintop of Jones' ship and led his men upon the interlocked yards to the enemy's top, which was cleared by the well directed fire of his command. He died in Charleston, S. C., Sept. 30th, 1806. Edmund Fanning, cousin of Nathaniel, fought on the other side during the Revolutionary War. He was colonel of a regiment raised on Long Island and called the Associated Refugees. (Onderdonk's *Revolutionary Incidents of Queen's County*.) He died in London in 1818.

chased a warehouse that had been John Tinker's, on Mill Cove. Hill, though styled of London, had previously been at the south, for in 1668, he assigned to Robert Prowse, merchant, all right to a plantation in Maryland, with milch cows and small cattle, &c., which had been four years jointly owned and cultivated by them.

Mr. Hill was chosen recorder of the town, February 25th, 1669-70, and held the office till his death. His handwriting was compact and neat, but not distinct. He was also clerk of the county court at the time of his decease. His first marriage is thus recorded: "Charles, son to George Hill, of Barley, Derbyshire, Esq., was married July 16, 1668, to Ruth, widow of John Picket." Children—Jane, born December 9th, 1669; Charles, October 16th, 1671; Ruth, baptized October, 1673, probably died in infancy; Jonathan, born December, 1674. Ruth, wife of Charles Hill, died April 30th, 1677. Charles Hill married, second, June 12th, 1678, Rachel, daughter of Major John Mason, deputy governor of the colony. This second wife and her infant child died in 1679.

Charles Hill, second, married Abigail Fox, August 28th, 1701. Jonathan Hill married Mary Sharswood, the date not recovered.

Pasco Foote, died probably in 1684.

We can scarcely err in assuming that he was son of Pasco Foote, of Salem, and that he was the Pasco Foote, Jr., of the Salem records, who married 2d 10th month, 1668, Martha Wood, and of whose marriage three sons are the recorded issue, Malachi, Martha and Pasco.¹ He appears in New London as a mariner, engaged in the Newfoundland trade, and marries November 30th, 1678, Margaret, daughter of Edward Stallion. Three children were the issue of this marriage, whose births are not recorded, Isaac, Stallion and Margaret. Edward Stallion, the grandfather, by a deed of adoption, took the second son, Stallion, for his own child, and at the same time, Pasco Foote settled his house and land in New London, on his youngest child, Margaret. These deeds, executed January 6th, 1683-4, give us our latest information of Pasco Foote. His relict married James Haynes, in 1687 or 1688.

Stallion Foote died in 1710, leaving a wife, Ann, and an only child, of his own name, *Stallion*, who died suddenly at the house of John Williams, on Groton bank, January 9th, 1714-15, aged six

years. On the 7th of March succeeding the death of the child, an entry was made on the New London record, of the following import: "Isaac, son of Pasco Foote, late of New London, deceased, and Margaret his wife, hath desired his name may be now recorded, Isaac, alias Stallion Foote." This person after 1715, disappears from our records.

Charles Haynes.

His inventory was presented in 1685. This is all the information obtained respecting the period of his decease. His marriage is not recorded.

Children of Charles Haynes and his wife Mary.

1. James, born March 1st, 1664-5.	4. Jonathan, born June 29th, 1674.
2. Peter, " November 21st, 1666.	5. Mary, " October 29th, 1678.
3. Charles, " Sept. 25th, 1669.	6. Hercules, " April 29th, 1681.

James and Jonathan Haynes settled in New London, and left descendants.

Edward Culver, died in 1685.

He had lived at Dedham, where the births of three children are recorded: John, April 15th, 1640; Joshua, January 12th, 1642-3; Samuel, January 9th, 1644-5; and at Roxbury, where the record of baptisms adds two more to the list of children, Gershom, December 3d, 1648; Hannah, April 11th, 1651.¹ His arrival at Pequot is announced by a land grant in 1653. He purchased the house-lot of Robert Burrows, given to the latter by the town, and established himself as a baker and brewer. In 1664 he relinquished the home-stead to his son John, and removed to a place near the head of Mystic, but within New London bounds, called by the Indians Chepadaso, and in one place recorded as Chepados Hill. During Philip's War, Edward Culver was a noted soldier and partisan, often sent out with Indian scouts to explore the wilderness.² In 1681, he is called "wheel-right of Mystic." The sons of Edward and Ann Culver, expressly named, are John, Joshua, Samuel and Joseph.³ It is supposed that Edward Culver, of Norwich, 1680, having wife Sarah,

¹ Savage, (MS.)

² Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 2, pp. 408, 417.

³ Perhaps *Gershom*, baptized at Roxbury, 1648, is a mistake for *Joseph*.

and children ranging in birth from 1681 to 1694, and in 1700, an inhabitant of the new town of Lebanon, should be added to the list. If so, he was probably born after the removal to Pequot, or about 1654. The identity of his name, however, is the only evidence we can produce of the relationship.

John Culver was for several years a resident in New Haven, where the birth of a daughter, Abigail, is recorded in 1676, and son, James, in 1679.¹ He ultimately returned to the neighborhood of the Mystic. Joshua Culver, married in 1673, Elizabeth Ford, of New Haven, and settled in Wallingford.² Samuel Culver, about the year 1674, eloped with the wife of John Fish, and is not known to have ever returned to this part of the country. Joseph Culver settled on his father's lands at Groton.

Isaac Willey,³ died about 1685.

Willey's house-lot was on Mill Brook, at the base of Post Hill. He was an agriculturist, and soon removed to a farm at the head of Nahantic River, which was confirmed to "old goodman Willie," in 1664. It is probable that both he and his wife Joanna, had passed the bounds of middle age, and that all their children were born before they came to the banks of the Pequot. Isaac Willey, Jr., was a married man at the time of his death, in 1662; John Willey was one who wrought on the mill-dam in 1651; Abraham had married and settled in Haddam before his father's decease. No other sons are known. Hannah, wife of Peter Blatchford, is the only daughter expressly named as such, but inferential testimony leads us to enroll among the members of this family, Joanna, wife of Robert Hempstead, and afterward of Andrew Lester; Mary, wife of Samuel Tubbes, and Sarah, wife of John Terrall.

Isaac Willey married, second, after 1670, Anna, relict of Andrew Lester,⁴ who survived him. The Willey farm was sold to Abel Moore and Chr. Christophers. John Willey married in 1670, Miriam, daughter of Miles Moore. He lived beyond the head of Nahant-

¹ Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

² Ibid.

³ He wrote his name *Isark Willy*. Mr. Bruen's orthography was *Willie*: he had a partiality for this termination, and wrote *Averie*, *Marie*, *Doxie*, &c.

⁴ She had been the third wife of his former son-in-law. Relationship was sometimes curiously involved by marriages. It must be recollected that the males outnumbered the females, and there could be no wide range of choice in the selection of a wife.

HISTORY OF NEW LONDON.

tick, and when the bounds between New London and Lyme were determined, his farm was split by the line, leaving twenty acres, on which stood his house, in New London.

Abraham Willey, the ancestor of the Haddam family, married Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Mortimer, of New London.

James Morgan, died about 1685.

He was about seventy-eight years of age.¹ The earliest notice of him is from the records of Boston, where the birth of his daughter, Hannah, is registered, eighteenth day, fifth month, 1642.² He was afterward of Gloucester, and came with the Cape Ann company to Pequot, where he acted as one of the townsmen, from 1653 to 1656, inclusive. His homestead, "on the path to New Street," was sold December 25th, 1657. He then removed east of the river, where he had large grants of land. The following additional grant alludes to his dwelling :

"James Morgan hath given him about six acres of upland where the wig-wams were in the path that goes from his house towards Culver's among the rocky hills."

He was often employed by the public in land surveys, stating highways and determining boundaries, and was nine times deputy to the General Court. His estate was settled in 1685, by division among his four children, James, John, Joseph and Hannah, wife of Nehemiah Royce.

James Morgan, 2d, married, "some time in the month of November, 1666," Mary Vine,³ of old England. This was the Capt. James Morgan, of Groton, who died December 8th, 1711. John Morgan married, November 16th, 1665, Rachel Dymond, by whom he had seven children. By a second wife, Elizabeth, supposed to have been daughter of William Jones, of New Haven,⁴ and granddaughter of Governor Eaton, he had six other children. Lieut. John Morgan died in Groton, 1712. Joseph Morgan married, in April, 1670, Dorothy, daughter of Thomas Parke. He died in Preston, April 5th,

¹ Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 800.

² Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol 6, p. 184.

³ Of the Vine family there has been no account recovered. The name can be traced in several families, as Vine Starr, Vine Utley, Vine Stoddard, &c.

⁴ In settling Mr. Jones' estate in 1707, one of the children mentioned is Elizabeth, wife of John Morgan. Judd, (MS.)

1704. These three sons are progenitors of a numerous body of descendants.

Richard Rose-Morgan, who settled in the western part of New London, (now Waterford,) in 1679 or 1680, is the ancestor of another line of Morgans, probably of a different family from James Morgan. His descendants for a considerable period, retained the adjunct of *Rose*, apparently to distinguish them from that family. Richard Rose-Morgan died in 1698, leaving sons, John, Richard and Benjamin, and several daughters. His relict, widow Hope-still Morgan, died June 1st, 1712.

Cary Latham, died in 1685.

Elizabeth, wife of Cary Latham, was daughter of John Masters, and relict of Edward Lockwood. Two children are recorded in Boston: Thomas, born ninth month, 1639; Joseph, second of tenth month, probably 1642.¹ John Latham, who died at New London, about 1684, is supposed to have been a third son. The daughters were four in number: Elizabeth, wife of John Leeds; Jane, of Hugh Hubbard; Lydia, of John Packer, and Hannah, unmarried at the time of her father's decease. Mr. Latham served in various town offices; he was one of the townsmen or selectmen for sixteen years, and was six times deputy to the General Court, from May, 1664, to 1670. His large grants of land enriched his descendants.

Thomas Latham, oldest son of Cary, married, October 15th, 1673, Rebecca, daughter of Hugh Wells, of Wethersfield. He died before his father, December 14th, 1677, leaving an only son, Samuel. His relict married John Packer.

Joseph, the second son, had a numerous family. His marriage is not recorded at New London. His first child, Cary, was born at Newfoundland, July 14th, 1668. He died in 1706, leaving seven sons, and a daughter, Lydia, the wife of Benjamin Starr.

Thomas Forster, died in 1685.

Of this sea-captain nearly all that is presented to our view is the registry of his marriage, and birth of his children.

“ Thomas, son of John Forster, of Kingsware, was married to Susannah, daughter of Ralph Parker, 27th of March, 1665-6.

1. **Susannah**, born March 4th, 1666-7.
2. **Thomas**, " Feb. 26th, 1668-9.
3. **Jonathan**, " Aug. 17th, 1673.
4. **Mary**, " June 14th, 1675.
5. **Samuel**, born Sept. 22d, 1678.
6. **Rebecca**, baptized June, 1681.
7. **Ebenezer**, " April, 1683."

Thomas Forster appears to have had brothers, Edward and Jonathan. His son, Jonathan, settled in Westerly, Rhode Island.

Hugh Hubbard, died in 1685.

"Hugh Hubbard, of Derbyshire, old England, was married to Jane, daughter of Cary Latham, in March, 1672-3." Beside a son that died in infancy, they had four daughters: 1. **Mary**, born November 17th, 1674; married, in 1697, "Ichabod Sayre, son of Francis Sayre, of Southampton, on Nassau Id., N. Y." This was the first marriage recorded by Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall. 2. **Lydia**, born February 7th, 1675-6; married John Burrows. 3. **Margaret**. 4. **Jane**. The relict of Hugh Hubbard married John Williams, and died May 3d, 1789, aged ninety-one.

Gabriel Woodmancy, died in 1685.

He is first introduced to our notice by the purchase of a homestead on what is now Shaw's Neck and Truman Street, in November, 1665. Three sons are mentioned: Thomas, born September 17th, 1670; settled in Shrewsbury, Monmouth county, New Jersey; Joseph and Gabriel. The last mentioned died without issue, in September, 1720, aged thirty-four. There was also a daughter, Sarah, born in March, 1673, who married in Killingworth, where she had descendants of the names of Hurd, Carter and Nettleton. Joseph, whom we may assume was born about 1680, is the ancestor of the Woodmancys of Groton.

Aaron Starke, died in 1685.

This name is found at Mystic as early as 1653. In May, 1666, Aaron Starke was among those who were to take the freeman's oath in Stonington, and in October, 1669, was accepted as freeman of New London. In the interim he had purchased the farm of William Thomson, the Pequot missionary, near the head of Mystic, which brought him within the bounds of New London. Neither his marriage nor his children are found recorded, but from the settlement of

his estate, it may be gathered that he had sons, Aaron, John and William, and that John Fish and Josiah Haynes were his sons-in-law.

John Stebbins, died probably in 1685.

In one deposition on record, his age is said to be sixty, in 1661, and in another, seventy, in 1675. Where the mistake lies, can not be decided. It is probable that he was the John Stebbins who had a son John born at Watertown, in 1640.¹ His wife, Margaret, died January 1st, 1678-9. Three children are mentioned: John, Daniel, and the wife of Thomas Marshall, of Hartford. John Stebbins, 2d, was married about 1663; his wife was Deborah, and is supposed to have been a daughter of Miles Moore. He died in 1707. Daniel Stebbins married Bethiah, daughter of Daniel Comstock. The brothers, John and Daniel Stebbins, were of that company to whom the Mohegan sachems made a munificent grant of a large part of Hebron and Colchester.

The name is almost invariably written in the earlier records, Stubbins, or Stubbing.

No clue has been obtained to the period of decease of Thomas Marritt, Nathaniel Holt, John Fish and William Peake. Their names, however, disappear from the rolls of living men, about 1685.

Thomas Marritt.—The name is given in his own orthography, but it is commonly recorded Merrit. He was probably the Thomas Maryot, made freeman of the Bay colony in 1636,² and the Thomas Merrit, of Cambridge, mentioned in the will of John Benjamin, in 1645.³ At New London, his first appearance is in 1664; he was chosen custom-master of the port, and county marshal, Dec. 15th, 1668, and was, for several years, the most conspicuous attorney in the place.

Nathaniel Holt.—William Holt, of New Haven, had a son, Nathaniel, born in 1647, who settled in New London in 1673, and married, April 5th, 1680, Rebecca, daughter of Thomas Beeby, 2d.

1 Farmer's Register.

2 Savage's Winthrop, vol. 2, p. 366.

3 Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol. 3, p. 177. In Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series, vol. 10, p. 118, *Mr. Myrior* is probably a mistake for *Myriot*.

Only two children of this marriage are recorded—William, born July 15th, 1681; Nathaniel, July 18th, 1682. From Thomas Beeby, the Holt family inherited the original homestead granted by the town to Thomas Parke, lying south-west of Robert Hempstead's lot, with a highway, (Hempstead Street,) between them. Sergeant Thomas Beeby purchased this lot of five acres, and left it to his descendants. In the original grant it is said, “*to run up the hill among the rocks.*” This description remained characteristic of the surface for nearly two hundred years, but its aptness is now fast melting away, before an advancing line of neat dwelling-houses, from whose windows the occupants look out over the roofs of their neighbors, upon a goodly prospect.¹

John Fish.—Probably identical with the John Fish, who was of Lynn, 1637.² In New London, he appears early in 1655, with wife and children. Of the latter, only three are traced, John, Jonathan and Samuel. In 1667, the wife of John Fish was Martha—probably a second wife, and a young woman. She was subsequently several times arraigned and admonished, on account of improper conduct, and finally eloped with Samuel Culver. Mr. Fish obtained a divorce from his recreant wife, in 1680, at which time it is said she had been gone six or seven years. Of the guilty couple nothing further is known. The estate of Mr. Fish was divided in 1687, between his two sons, Jonathan and Samuel. John Fish, Jr., is mentioned in 1684, but his name not appearing in the division of the estate, it may be conjectured that he had received his portion and settled elsewhere.³

William Peake, or Pike.—His residence was west of the town-plot, on the path leading to Fog Plain. Only three children are mentioned:

Sarah, married, Dec. 27th, 1671, Abraham Dayne or Deane.

¹ About the year 1846, Mr. David Bishop, with great labor, succeeded in cutting a chamber out of the solid rock for a foundation, upon which he erected a handsome house. A street has since been opened over the hill, a number of neat houses built, and the name of Mountain Avenue given to it.

² Farmer's Register.

³ Perhaps in Newtown, Long Island. In the patent of Newtown, granted in 1686, are the names of John, Samuel and Nathan Fish. The same names occur among the sons of Samuel Fish, of Groton, suggesting a connection with the Newtown family.

William, who settled in Lyme, and married, June 24th, 1679, Abigail Comstock.

John, who remained in New London, had wife, Elizabeth, and children, John, born 1690; Samuel, 1693; William, 1695, and Ruth, 1699. John Pike died, Oct. 2d, 1699.

Christopher Christophers, died July 23d, 1687.

Two brothers, of the name of Christophers, both mariners, and engaged in the exchange trade with Barbadoes, settled in New London about 1665.

Jeffrey was aged fifty-five in 1676; of course born about 1621 Christopher was, at his death, aged fifty-six; born about 1631. That they were brothers, conclusive evidence remains, in documents upon record, wherein the relationship is expressed.

Jeffrey Christophers had a son of the same name, who was also a mariner, and who died May 17th, 1690, of the small-pox. Jane, the wife of the said Jeffrey Christophers, Jr., died of the same disease three weeks after her husband. Jeffrey, Sen., had no other son. Three daughters are mentioned: Joanna, wife of John Mayhew; Margaret, wife of Abraham Corey, of Southold, and the wife of a Mr. Parker, or Packer, of the same place. In 1700, Jeffrey Christophers was living at Southold, with one of these daughters. The date of his death is not known.

Christopher Christophers, having purchased the Doxey or Lane house-lot, on the Town Street, built thereon, about 1680, a new house which is supposed to be the same structure, in the frame and fashion of it, that has been known, of late years, as the Wheat house. According to tradition, the timber of which it was built, grew upon the spot. After one hundred and seventy years of endurance, the frame was still firm and substantial. It was one of the six fortified houses of 1676, and subsequently, when enlarged, the addition was built over the old sloping roof. Another and larger house was built by the side of it, on the same home-lot, and probably on the site of the Doxey or Lane house, about the year 1710, in which resided the second Christopher Christophers, grandson of the former. This has more recently been known as the Hurlbut house, (corner of Main and Federal Streets.) Both of these houses were taken down in 1851, and the new and tasteful mansions of Messrs. Lawrence and Miner, now occupy their places.

Mr. Christophers brought with him to New London, a wife, Mary,

and three children, Richard, John and Mary. An ancient record in the family, states that Richard was born, July 13th, 1662, at *Chaf-ton's Forris*, in Devonshire, England; probably *Cherston Ferrers*, a village on Torbay, near Dartmouth. Mrs. Mary Christophers died July 13th, 1676, aged fifty-five years, which was ten years in advance of the age of her husband. Her grave-stone is the second in chronological order in the old burial-ground, being the next in date to the tablet of Richard Lord. Mr. Christophers afterward married Elizabeth, relict of Peter Bradley. A certificate of this marriage is indorsed upon one of the town books, without any reference to time, or place, or the officiating magistrate, but simply attested by two witnesses, Mary Shapley and Jane Hill, the latter a child, eight or nine years of age—both nieces of the bride.

Christopher Christophers died July 23d, 1687, aged fifty-six.

Mrs. Elizabeth Christophers, died in 1708, "aged about seventy."¹

Richard Christophers married, Jan. 26th, 1681, Lucretia Bradley. She died in 1691. His second wife was Grace Turner, of Situate. The two wives were cousins, and both granddaughters of Jonathan Brewster. Richard Christophers was much employed in public affairs, and one of the most prominent individuals of the town in his day. He was an assistant in the colony, judge of the county court and court of probate. He died June 9th, 1726, leaving a large estate. His will provides for two sons and seven daughters. Six sons had deceased before him. His oldest son, Christopher, succeeded to all his appointments and public offices, but very soon followed him into the grave. He died Feb. 5th, 1728-9, in the forty-sixth year of his age. Estate, £4,468.

John Christophers, second son of the first Christopher Christophers, married, July 28th, 1696, Elizabeth Mulford, of Long Island. He died in Barbadoes in 1703. His only son, John, was wrecked near Montauk, on a return voyage from the same island, and drowned, in July, 1723. By this event, the male issue in this branch became extinct, and the name centered in the family of Richard. The elder John Christophers had two daughters, who inherited the estate. Elizabeth who married the third Joshua Raymond, had the farm on Niantick River, called Pine Neck. Esther, who married Thomas Man-

¹ A part of her grave-stone, containing the date, is broken off and missing, but if Mrs. Christophers was forty-two years of age in 1680, the date must have been 1708. See note before, under article *Bradley*.

waring, had the farm at Black Point. Elizabeth, relict of John Christophers, married the third John Picket.

The names of Picket and Christophers, which, for a century and a half were common in the town, and borne by persons of note and affluence, whose families also were numerous, have entirely disappeared from the place; but it is supposed that some branches, formerly diverging from the parent stock in New London, are continued in other parts of the Union.

John Richards, died in 1687.

Of this person, no account previous to his appearance in New London, has been found. His marriage is not recorded, and it is probable that it took place elsewhere. He had seven children baptized, March 26th, 1671—John, Israel, Mary, Penelope, Lydia, Elizabeth and Hannah. David was baptized July 27th, 1673. It is presumed that these eight form a complete list of his children. John, the oldest son, was born in 1666. He married Love, daughter of Oliver Manwaring, and had a family of ten children, all of whom died under twenty years of age, except four—John, George, Samuel and Lydia. John married Anna Prentis; George married Esther Hough; Samuel married Ann, (Denison,) relict of Jabez Hough; Lydia married John Proctor, of Boston.

Israel, the second son of the elder John Richards, inherited from his father a farm, “near the Mill Pond, about two miles to the northward of the town plot.” He had two sons, Israel and Jeremiah, and several daughters.

David Richards, the third son, married Elizabeth Raymond, Dec. 14th, 1698.

Samuel Starr, died, probably, in 1688.

Mr. Starr is not mentioned upon the records of New London, at an earlier date than his marriage with Hannah, daughter of Jonathan Brewster, Dec. 23d, 1664. His wife was aged thirty-seven, in 1680. Their children were, Samuel, born Dec. 11th, 1665; Thomas, Sept. 27th, 1668; Comfort, baptized by Mr. Bradstreet, in August, 1671; Jonathan, baptized in 1674, and Benjamin, in 1679.

The residence of this family was on the south-west corner of the Bradley lot, (corner of Main and State Streets, or Buttonwood corner.) Mr. Starr was appointed county marshal,¹ in 1678, and prob-

¹ Equivalent to sheriff.

ably held the office till his death. No will, inventory, or record of the settlement of his estate has been found, but a deed was executed Feb. 2d, 1687-8, by Hannah, widow of Samuel Starr, and it is probable that her husband had then recently deceased.

Samuel Starr was undoubtedly a descendant of "Comfort Starr, of Ashford, chirurgeon," who came to New England, in the Hercules, of Sandwich, 1635, with three children and three servants.¹ The coincidence of names, suggests an intimate family connection. The three children of the chirurgeon are supposed to have been Thomas, John and Comfort. Thomas followed the profession of his father, is styled a surgeon, and was living in Yarmouth, Mass., from 1648 to 1670.² He had two children born in Situate—Comfort, in 1644, and Elizabeth, in 1646. It is probable that he had other children, and according to our conjecture, one older, viz., our Samuel Starr, of New London. The church records of Ipswich, state that Mary, wife of Comfort Starr, was admitted to that church in March, 1671, and in May, 1673, dismissed to the church in New London. She was received here in June, and her husband's name appears on the town record, about the same period, but he is supposed to have removed to Middletown. This was probably the brother of Samuel, and identical with Comfort Starr, born in 1644.

Samuel Starr, Jun., is mentioned in 1685, and again in 1687. He then disappears, and no descendants have been found in this vicinity. Of Comfort, third son of Samuel, nothing is known after his baptism in 1671. It may be presumed that he died young. The second and fourth sons, Thomas and Jonathan, settled east of the river, in the present town of Groton, on land which some of their descendants still occupy. Thomas Starr is called a shipwright. In the year 1710, he sold a sloop, called the Sea Flower, which he describes as "a square sternen vessel of sixty-seven tons, and six-seventh of a ton burden, built by me in Groton," for £180. This is our latest account of him till we meet with the notice of his death, which took place Jan. 31st, 1711-12.

Thomas and Jonathan Starr married sisters, Mary and Elizabeth Morgan, daughters of Capt. James Morgan. Samuel, the oldest son of Jonathan, removed to Norwich, and is the founder of the Norwich family of Starrs. Jonathan, the second son, was the ancestor of the present Jonathan Starr, Esq., of New London, and of the late Capt.

1 Gleanings by Savage, in Mass. Hist. Coll., 3d series, vol. 8, p. 275.

2 Deane's Hist. of Situate, p. 247, and Thatcher's Medical Biography.

Jared Starr. Richard, another brother of this family, removed to Hinsdale, Mass., and was one of the fathers of that new settlement, and a founder of its infant church.¹

The descendants of Jonathan Starr have been remarkable for longevity—eight of his children lived to be eighty, and most of them over eighty-five years of age. One of his daughters, Mrs. Turner, was one hundred years and seven months old. In the family of his son Jonathan, the father, mother and four children, averaged ninety years of age. The third Jonathan lived to be ninety-five, and his brother, Capt. Jared Starr, to his ninetieth year. A similar length of years characterized their partners in marriage. Mrs. Mary (Seabury) Starr, lived to the age of ninety-nine years; and Elizabeth, relict of Capt. Joseph Starr, of Groton, (brother of Jonathan, 2d,) died at the age of one hundred years, four months and eight days.

Benjamin Starr, the youngest son of the first Samuel, (born 1679,) settled in New London, and has had many descendants here. He purchased, in 1702, of the heirs of Thomas Dymond, a house, garden, and wharf, upon Bream Cove, east side, where the old bridge crossed the cove, which was then regarded as the end of the town in that direction. The phrase—from the fort to Benjamin Starr's—comprehended the whole length of the bank. The water, at high tide, came up to the base of Mr. Starr's house; and the dwellings south-east of it, known as the Crocker and Perriman houses, founded on the rocks, had the tide directly in their rear, so as to preclude the use of doors on the water side. The quantity of made land in that vicinity, and the recession of the water, consequent upon bridging and wharfing, has entirely altered the original form of the shore around Bream Cove. A foot-bridge, with a draw, spanned the cove, by the side of Mr. Starr, and connected him with his opposite neighbor, Peter Harris.

Philip Bill, died July 8th, 1689.

Mr. Bill, and a daughter named Margaret, died the same day, victims of an epidemic throat distemper, that was prevalent in July and

1 Richard Starr was a man eminent for piety. Mrs. Mary Starr (wife of Jonathan) used to say, "Brother Richard comes to see us once a year, and I always feel at his departure, as if an angel had been visiting us." This testimonial is the more pleasing, from the fact that the two families belonged to different religious denominations—Richard Starr was a Congregationalist; Mrs. Starr of the Episcopal communion.

August of this year. He settled east of the river, in that part of the township which is now Ledyard, before 1670. Mr. Bradstreet baptized his son Jonathan, November 5th, 1671, and adds to the record that the father was member of the church at Ipswich. Another son, Joshua, was baptized in 1675. The older children, probably born in Ipswich, were Philip, Samuel, John and Elizabeth. Hannah, relict of Philip Bill, married Samuel Bucknall. Philip Bill, Jr., was sergeant of the first company of train-bands formed in Groton. His wife was Elizabeth, daughter of Andrew Lester. Their oldest son, Philip, was lost at sea, or died abroad. Sergeant Philip Bill, who "lived near the Long Hill in Groton," died July 10th, 1739, aged above eighty. "The church bell (says Hempstead in his diary,) tolled twice on that occasion." We infer from this that it was customary at that day to have only a death-bell to announce decease, but no passing-bell to solemnize the funeral.

Abel Moore, died July 9th, 1689.

This event occurred at Dedham, Mass., and was caused by the extreme heat of the weather. He was constable of the town that year, and had been to Boston, probably on business connected with his public duties.

Abel Moore was the son, and as far as we know the only son of Miles Moore, and his wife, Isabel Joyner. Of the death of the parents we have no account, but it is probable that they had deceased before their son. They were both living in 1680, when Mr. Bradstreet records as admitted to full communion in the church, "old goodman Moore and his wife, sometime members of the church at Guildford"—Guilford is here unquestionably a mistake for Milford. Miriam, wife of John Willey, is the only daughter of Miles Moore, that is well ascertained; but it is probable that Deborah, wife of John Stebbins, Jun., had the same parentage.

Abel Moore married, September 22d, 1670, Hannah, daughter of Robert Hempstead. Their children were Miles, born September 24th, 1671; Abel, July 14th, 1674; Mary, born in 1678; John in 1680, and Joshua, to whose birth or age no reference has been found. Hannah, relict of Abel Moore, married Samuel Waller.

Smith.

We find the name of Giles Smith, at Hartford, in 1639; at New London, in 1647; at Fairfield, in 1651. These three are doubtless

one and the same person. At Fairfield, he found a resting place, and there remained till his death.¹

Ralph Smith was a transient resident in 1657, and again in 1659.

Richard Smith came to the plantation in 1652, from "Martin's Vineyard," but soon went to Wethersfield. Another Richard Smith was a householder in 1655, occupying the lot of Jarvis Mudge, near the burial ground; but he also removed to Wethersfield, where the two were styled senior and junior, but they do not appear to have been father and son. This name, *Richard Smith*, was often repeated on the list of early emigrants. Two persons bearing it, one aged forty-three, and the other twenty-eight, are among the passengers that came to America in the *Speedwell*, in 1656.² A Richard Smith settled in Narragansett, before 1650, and was a man of influence in all concerns relating to the Indians of that neighborhood. He had a son of the same name. Another Richard Smith belongs to the early history of Lyme, where his name appears as a landholder in 1670. These have been enumerated, in order to distinguish them carefully from Richard Smith of New London, who had no connection that can be discovered, with any of them.

"Richard Smith and Bathsheba Rogers (daughter of James,) were married together by me, Daniel Wetherell, commissioner, March 4, 1669, (70.)"

Mr. Smith died in 1682, and his relict married Samuel Fox. Four children of the first marriage are mentioned, *viz.*, Elizabeth, who married William Camp; Bathsheba, who married her cousin, John Rogers, 2d; John, who subsequently settled in the North Parish, and left descendants there, and James. The last named was probably the oldest son. He was baptized April 12th, 1674; married Elizabeth, daughter of Jonathan Rogers, and has had an unbroken line of descendants in the town to the present day. He is the ancestor of the four brothers Smith, who have been such successful whaling captains from New London, since the year 1820.

Other early settlers of New London, of the name of Smith, were Nehemiah, John and Edward. The first two were brothers, and the last named, their nephew. Nehemiah had previously lived in New Haven, and the birth of his son Nehemiah, the only soh that appears on record, was registered there in 1646. John Smith came from Boston, with his wife Joanna and daughter Elizabeth, who appears

¹ Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

² Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol. 1, p. 182.

to have been his only child. Edward Smith is first named in 1660. He settled on a farm east of the river.

Nehemiah Smith, the elder, connected himself with the association that settled Norwich, in 1660, and removed to that plantation, where he died in 1684. He left four daughters: Mary, wife of Samuel Raymond; Ann, wife of Thomas Bradford; Elizabeth, wife of Joshua Raymond, and Experience, wife of Joshua Abel, of Norwich. His son, Nehemiah Smith, 2d, married Lydia, daughter of Alexander Winchester, of Roxbury, October 24th, 1669. He was for many years in the commission of the peace, an honorable and venerated man; usually styled on the records, *Mr. Justice Smith*. He died in 1727, and was buried at Pequonuck, in Groton, where the latter years of his life were spent. It was this Nehemiah Smith who made the large purchase of soldier land at Niantic, in 1692, which he assigned, in 1698, to his second son, Samuel. The latter settled on this land, and is the progenitor of several families of the name, both of Lyme and New London.

John Smith remained in the town plot, and after 1659, held the offices of commissioner, custom-master and grand-juryman. His residence was in New, or Cape Ann Street.

"Feb. 1666-7. John Smith hath given him the two trees that stand in the street before his house for shade, not to be cut down by any person."

He died in 1680. His will was accepted in the county court, with this notification, "The court doth desire the widow to consider her husband's kinsman, Edward Smith." The will had been made in favor of the wife, in violation, as was claimed, of certain promises made to his nephew. A suit at law ensued between the parties. The case was finally carried to the court of assistants, at Hartford, by whose decision the will was sustained. Joanna Smith, the widow, was noted as a doctress. She made salves, and was skillful to heal wounds and bruises, as well as to nurse and tend the sick. Her services in this way, she maintained, had contributed in no small degree to the prosperity of her husband. She died in 1687, aged about seventy-three years. Her estate was inherited by her daughter, Elizabeth Way, of Lyme, and her grandsons, George and Thomas Way.

Edward Smith married, June 7th, 1663, Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Bliss, of Norwich. This couple, together with their son John, aged fifteen, died of the epidemic disease of 1689; the son, July 8th; the wife, July 10th, and Edward Smith, July 14th. They left a son, Obadiah, twelve years of age, and six daughters, who all

went to reside with their friends in Norwich, and mostly settled in that place.¹

These, with Lieut. Samuel Smith, from Wethersfield, whose career has been traced in a preceding chapter, comprise all the grantees of the town, of the name of Smith, previous to 1690.

Walter Bodington, died September 17th, 1689.

He was a single man who had occupied for a few years certain lands east of the river, which he purchased of the heirs of Thomas Bailey. The orthography of the name has since varied into Buddington. Walter Bodington, Jr., nephew of the deceased, was appointed administrator, as being nearest of kin. Joseph Nest had some interest in the estate, perhaps in right of his wife, who may have been sister to the younger Walter. Of this family no early record is found, either of marriages or births. The second Walter Bodington died November 20th, 1713. His will mentions son Walter, and children of John Wood; from which it is inferred that Mary, the first wife of John Wood, was his daughter. The Buddington family of Groton, have never suffered the name of *Walter* to be at any time missing from the family line.

John Packer, died in 1689.

With this early settler in Groton, only a slight acquaintance has been obtained. He fixed his habitation, about the year 1655, in close proximity to the Pequot Indians, who had congregated at Naiwayonk, (Noank.) His children can only be gathered incidentally. He had John, Samuel and Richard, probably by his first wife, Elizabeth. He married for his second wife, June 24th, 1676, Rebecca, widow of Thomas Latham, and had a son James, baptized September 11th, 1681. Two other sons, Joseph and Benjamin, and a daughter named Rebecca, may also be assigned to this wife, who survived him, and afterward married a Watson, of Kingston, Rhode Island.

John Packer, 2d, married Lydia, daughter of Cary Latham. He died in 1701. Benjamin Packer, in 1709, "having been impressed into the army to fight the French," made his will, bequeathing his

¹ The son was that Capt. Obadiah Smith, of Norwich, who died in 1727, and whose grave-stone bears the quaint, but touching epitaph:

"And now beneath these carved stones,
Rich treasure lies—dear Smith, his bones."

patrimony of sixty acres of land, to his brothers, James and Joseph, and sister Rebecca. He probably never returned from the frontier.

Capt. James Packer inherited from his father a controversy respecting the extent of his lands at Nawayonk, which commenced with the Indians before their removal, and was continued with the town of Groton. In 1735, a compromise was effected by commissioners appointed by the General Assembly. This was an occasion of great local interest, and on the 5th of August, when the commissioners, "Major Timothy Pierce, Mr. West, of Lebanon, and Sheriff Huntington, of Windham," left New London, on their way to view the contested premises, they were accompanied by forty mounted men from the town, and found their train continually increasing as they proceeded. On the ground a large assembly had convened. The neighboring farm-houses, Smith's, Niles', &c., were filled to overflowing with guests.¹ This is mentioned as exhibiting a characteristic of the times. Our early local history is every where besprinkled with such gatherings. Capt. James Packer died in 1764, aged eighty-four.

William Chapell, died in 1689 or 1690.

This name is often in the confused orthography of the old records confounded with *Chappell*, but they appear to have been from the first, distinct names. Some clerks were very careful to note the distinction, putting an accent over the *a*, or writing it double, *Chaapel*. William Chapell, in 1659, bought a house-lot in New Street, in partnership with Richard Waring, (Warren?) In 1667, he was associated with William Peake, in the purchase of various lots of rugged, uncleared land, hill, ledge and swamp, on the west side of the town plot, which they divided between them.² William Peake settled on what has since been called the Rockdale farm, now James Brown's, and William Chapell, on the Cohanzie road, upon what is at present known as the Cavarly farm. A considerable part of the Chapell land was afterward purchased by the Latimer family.

Children of William Chapell and his wife Christian.

1. Mary, born February 14th, 1668-9; married John Wood.
2. John, born Feb. 28th, 1671-2; married Sarah Lewis, August 26th, 1698.

¹ Hempstead's Diary.

² A considerable part of the Peake and Chapell land was sold by them to Mrs. Ann Latimer. On this Latimer purchase, which lay on the south-eastern slope of Wolfpit Hill, (now Prospect Hill,) the Cedar Grove Cemetery was laid out in 1851.

3. William, " born nigh the end of Sept. 1677."
4. Christian, " " " end of Feb. 1680-1;" married a Fairbanks.
5. William.
6. Joseph, married Bethiah Dart.

Edward Stallion married Christian Chapell, relict of William, in 1693.

In February, 1695, William Chapell, aged eight years and a half, was delivered " to Jonathan Prentis, mariner, to be instructed in the mariner's art and navigation, by said Prentis, or in case of his death, by his *Dame*." This lad died in 1704. The descendants of John and Joseph Chapell, the oldest and youngest sons of William and Christian, are numerous. There was a John Chapell, of Lyme, in 1678, and onward, probably brother of William, senior, of New London.

Thomas Minor,¹ died October 23d, 1690.

Mrs. Grace Minor deceased the same month. A long stone of rough granite in the burial ground at Wickutequack, almost imbedded in the turf, bears the following rudely cut inscription: "Here lyeth the body of Lieutenant Thomas Minor, aged eighty-three years. Departed 1690." It is said that Mr. Minor had selected this stone from his own fields, and had often pointed it out to his family, with the request—Lay this stone on my grave.

Mr. Minor bore a conspicuous part in the settlement, both of New London and Stonington. His personal history belongs more particularly to the latter place. His wife was Grace, daughter of Walter Palmer, and his children recorded in New London, are Manasseh, born April 28th, 1647, to whom we must accord the distinction of being the first born male after the settlement of the town; two daughters who died in infancy; Samuel, born March 4th, 1652, and Hannah, born September 15th, 1655. He had several sons older than Manasseh, viz., John, Joseph, Thomas, Clement and Ephraim.

John Minor was for a short period under instruction at the expense of the commissioners of the New England colonies, who wished to prepare him for an interpreter and teacher of the gospel to the Indians. The education of John Stanton was also provided for in the same way. The proficiency of these youths in the Indian language, probably led to the selection. Neither of them followed out the plan of their patrons, though both became useful men, turning their edu-

¹ This name is now commonly written Miner. We use in this work, the original autograph authority.

cation to good account, as recorders, justices, &c. John Minor is supposed to have emigrated to Stratford, in 1657 or 1658, and from thence removed to Woodbury, where he served as town-clerk for many years.¹ The only son of Thomas Minor that settled permanently in New London, was Clement.

Clement Minor married in 1662, Frances, relict of Isaac Willey, Jr.

Children of Clement and Frances Minor.

Mary, born Jan. 19th, 1664-5. William, born Nov. 6th, 1670.

Joseph, " Aug. 6th, 1666. Ann, " Nov. 30th, 1672.

Clement, born Oct. 6th, 1668.

Frances, wife of Clement Minor, died Jan. 6th, 1672-3.

He married second, Martha, daughter of William Wellman, formerly of New London, but then of Killingworth.

Phoebe, daughter of Clement and Frances Minor, was born April 13th, 1679. (This is so recorded, but *Frances* is a palpable mistake for *Martha*.)

Martha, wife of Clement Minor, died July 5th, 1681.

Mr. Minor usually appears on the records either as Ensign Clement, or Deacon Clement Minor. He married a third wife—Joanna—whose death occurred very near his own, in October, 1700.

"William Mynar, married Lydia, daughter of John Richards, Nov. 15. 1678." This was not a descendant of Thomas Minor, but the person better known as William Mynard or Maynard.

George Miller, died in 1690.

This person had been a resident, east of the river, (in Groton,) from the year 1679, and perhaps longer. He left four daughters, Mary, wife of Stephen Loomer; Elizabeth, second wife of Edward Stallion; Sarah, second wife of the second John Packer, and Priscilla, then unmarried.

Robert Miller settled in the Nahantick district, upon the border of Lyme, about 1687. He died May 14th, 1711, leaving sons Robert and John. No connection has been ascertained between George of Groton, and Robert of Nahantick.

John Lamb.

This name is found on the New London Rate List of 1664, and on the list of freemen in 1669. In December, 1668, he is styled

¹ Capt. John Minor was deputy from Stratford to the General Court, in October, 1676. Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 2, p. 286.

"John Lamb, now of Pockatuck, alias Southerton." He purchased land of Edward and Ann Culver "at a place called in Indian Wontobish, near the house of the said Lamb." This land was in 1695, confirmed to Thomas, "oldest son of John Lamb, deceased," by John, son of Edward Culver; and Thomas Lamb assigns a part of it to his brother Samuel.¹

Another John Lamb of Stonington died Jan. 10th, 1703-4, leaving a wife Lydia—sons John, Joseph and David—and seven daughters.

Isaac Lamb was an inhabitant of Groton in 1696. He died in 1728—leaving six daughters. No other residents of this name have been traced before 1700.

John Bennet, died September 22d, 1691.

This person was at Mystic as early as 1658. He had sons—William (born 1660;) John and Joseph.

James Bennet, shipwright, died in New London May 7th, 1690.

Thomas Bennet was a resident of New London from 1692 to 1710. He removed to Groton and there died Feb. 4th, 1722. His wife was Sarah, the only surviving child of Lawrence Codner.

Henry Bennet of Lyme died in 1726, leaving three sons and four married daughters. It is probable that all these had a common ancestor, whose name does not appear on our records.

John Prentis.

No account of the death of this early member of the community has been found, but the probate proceedings show that it took place in 1691.

Valentine Prentis or Prentice came to New England in 1631, with wife Alice and son John, having buried one child at sea. He settled in Roxbury, where he soon died, and his relict married (April 3d, 1634) John Watson.²

John Prentis, the son of Valentine and Alice, became an inhabitant of New London in 1652, and probably brought his wife, Hester, with him from Roxbury. Though living in New London he con-

1 The names are similar to those found in the family of John Lamb of Springfield, but a connection with that family has not been ascertained.

2 Genealogy of the Prentis family, by C. J. F. Binney.

nected himself with the Roxbury church in September, 1665, and thither he carried most of his children to be baptized.

Children of John and Hester Prentis, recorded in New London.

John, born Aug. 6th, 1652.	Stephen, Dec. 26th, 1666.
Joseph, born Apr. 2d, 1655, died 1676.	Mercy, " 1668, died 1689.
Jonathan, born July 15th, 1657.	Hannah, born June, 1672.
Esther, born July 20th, 1660.	Thomas, } twins, Nov. 6th, 1675.
Peter, born July 31st, 1663, died 1670.	Elizabeth, }

In 1685, John Prentis married Rebecca, daughter of Ralph Parker, by whom he had a son Ralph, who was infirm from his birth, and maintained until death from the estate of his parents. These are all the children that appear on record, but in the final settlement of the estate of Prentis in 1706, a Valentine Prentis of Woodbury comes in for a share, and gives a quitclaim deed to the executor, whom he calls "my loving brother, Capt. John Prentis." Again, on the death of Capt. Thomas Prentis, youngest son of John, who died without issue in 1741, his estate was distributed to seven brothers and sisters, one of whom was Valentine Prentis of Woodbury. These facts justify us in assigning to Valentine a place among the sons of John Prentis, and probably he was the youngest child of the first marriage, and born before 1680.

Esther Prentis married Benadam Gallop of Stonington.

Hannah Prentis married Lieut. John Frink of Stonington.

Elizabeth Prentis lived unmarried to the age of ninety-five.

She died December 13th, 1770.

It has been mentioned that John Prentis was by trade a blacksmith. He pursued his craft in New London for six or seven years and then removed to a farm in the neighborhood of Robin Hood's Bay (Jordan Cove) near the Bentworth farm; but in a few years once more changed his main pursuit and entered upon a seafaring life. His sons also, one after another (according to the usual custom of New London) began the business of life upon the sea. In 1675, John Prentis, Jr., commanded the barque Adventure, in the Barbadoes trade. In 1680, the elder John and his son Jonathan owned and navigated a vessel, bearing the family name of "John and Hester." Thomas Prentis also became a noted sea-captain, making a constant succession of voyages to Newfoundland and the West Indies, from 1695 to 1720.

John Prentis the second, married Sarah Jones, daughter of Mrs. Ann Latimer, by her first husband Matthew Jones of Boston. They had a family of five daughters, who were connected in marriage as

follows: Ann with Capt. Thomas Hosmer; Sarah with Thomas Mighill, both of Hartford: Patience, with Rev. John Bulkley of Colchester; Elizabeth, with Samuel Green, (son of Jonas Green,) and Irene with Naboth Graves—the two last of New London. Among these children, the father, in 1711, distributed the Indian servants of his household—Rachel and her children—in this order:

"To my son-in-law Thomas Hosmer of Hartford, one black girl named Simone, till she is 30—then she is to be free. To my son-in-law John Bulkley, Bilhah,—to be free at 32. To my daughter Sarah, Zilpha—to be free at 32—To my daughter Elizabeth, a black boy named Hannibal—to be free at 35. To my daughter Irene, a boy named York, free at 35. To Scipio I have promised freedom at 30. Rachel the mother, I give to Irene—also the little girl with her, named Dido, who is to be free at 32." To this bequest is added to the three youngest daughters, then unmarried, each—"a feather bed and its furniture."

Stephen Prentis, son of John the elder, inherited the farm of his father, near Niantic ferry, where he died in 1758, aged ninety-two. His wife was Elizabeth, daughter of John Rogers and granddaughter of Matthew Griswold.

John Wheeler, died December 16th, 1691.

No connection has been traced between John Wheeler of New London, and Thomas and Isaac Wheeler, cotemporary inhabitants of Stonington. John is first presented to us, as part owner of a vessel called the Zebulon, in 1667. He entered largely into mercantile concerns, traded with the West Indies, and had a vessel built under his own superintendence, which at the period of his death had just returned from an English voyage.

He left a son, Zaccheus, sixteen years of age, who died, without issue in 1703; also sons Joshua, eleven years of age, and William, eight. These lived to old age, and left descendants. Elizabeth, relict of John Wheeler, married Richard Steer—a person of whom very little is known, except in connection with the Wheeler family. He appears to have had a good business education, and to have been esteemed for capacity and intelligence, but his native place and parentage are unknown, and he stands disconnected with posterity.

1 A high bedstead, with a large feather-bed beat up full and round, with long curtains and an elaborately quilted spread, was an article of housekeeping highly prized by our ancestral dames.

Avery.

Christopher Avery was one of the selectmen of Gloucester, Mass., between 1646 and 1654.¹ On the 8th of August, 1665, he is at New London purchasing the house, orchard and lot of Robert Burrows, in the town plot. In June, 1667, he was released from watching and training. In October, 1669, made freeman of the colony. Charles Hill, the town-clerk, makes this memorandum of his decease.

"Christopher Avery's death, vide, near the death of mother Brewster."

The reference is to Lucretia, relict of Jonathan Brewster, (mother-in-law to Mr. Hill,) but no record of her death is to be found. James Avery in 1685 gives a deed to his four sons, of the house, orchard and land, "which belonged, (he says) to my deceased father Christopher Avery."

No other son but James, has been traced. It may be conjectured that this family came from Salisbury, England, as a Christopher Avery of that place, had wife Mary buried in 1591.²

James Avery and Joanna Greenslade were married, Nov. 10th, 1643. This is recorded in Gloucester. The records of Boston church have the following entry.

"17 of 1 mo. 1644. Our sister Joan Greenslade, now the wife of one James Averill had granted her by the church's silence, letters of recommendation to the Ch. at Gloster."³

The births of three children are recorded at Gloucester; these are repeated at New London, and the others registered from time to time. The whole list is as follows.

Hannah, born Oct. 12th, 1644.	Rebecca, born Oct. 6th, 1656.
James, " Dec. 16th, 1646.	Jonathan, " Jan. 5th, 1658-9.
Mary, " Feb. 19th, 1648.	Christopher, " Ap. 30th, 1661.
Thomas, " May 6th, 1651.	Samuel, " Aug. 14th, 1664.
John, " Feb. 10th, 1653-4.	Joanna, 1669.

James Avery was sixty-two years old in 1682; of course born on the other side of the ocean about 1620. At New London he took an important part in the affairs of the plantation. He was chosen townsmen in 1660 and held the office twenty-three years, ending with 1680. He was successively, ensign, lieutenant and captain of the

¹ Babson of Gloucester.

² Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 10, p. 139.

³ Savage (MS.)

only company of train-bands in the town, and was in active service through Philip's War. He was twelve times deputy to the General Court, between 1658 and 1680, was in the commission of the peace, and sat as assistant judge in the county court.

He removed to Pequonuck, east of the river, between 1660 and 1670, where both he and his wife were living in 1693. Deeds of lands to his sons, including the homestead farm, in Feb., 1693-4, probably indicate the near approach of death. His sons Jonathan and Christopher died young, and probably without issue. The descendants of James, Jr., Thomas, John, and Samuel, are very numerous, and may be regarded as four distinct streams of life. Groton is the principal hive of the family.

Capt. George Denison, died Oct. 23d, 1694.

This event took place at Hartford during the session of the General Court. His grave-stone at that place is extant, and the age given, seventy-six, shows that the date of 1621, which has been assigned for his birth, is too late, and that 1619 should be substituted. This diminishes the difference of age between him and his second wife *Ann*, who, according to the memorial tablet erected by her descendants at Mystic, deceased Sept. 26th, 1712, aged ninety-seven.

The history of George Denison will not be fully attempted here, but a few data gathered with care may be offered, as contributions toward the task of liberating the facts from the webs which ingenious fancy and exaggerative tradition, have thrown around them.

William Denison is accounted a fellow-passenger with the Rev. John Elliot, of Roxbury, in "the Lyon," which brought emigrants to America in 1631. His name is the *third* on the list of church members of Roxbury, in the record made by Elliot. He is known to have brought with him three sons, Daniel, Edward and George. The latter married in 1640, Bridget Thompson, who is supposed to have been a sister of the Rev. William Thompson, of Braintree, Mass. They had two children, Sarah, born March 20th, 1641, and Hannah, born May 20th, 1643. His wife died in August, 1643. Mr. Denison the same year visited his native country, and engaged in the civil conflict with which the kingdom was convulsed. He was absent a couple of years, and on his return brought with him a second wife¹—a lady of Irish parentage, viz., *Ann*, daughter of

¹ It is one of the many traditions respecting Capt. George Denison, that he started for England to obtain a second wife, from the funeral of the first, only waiting to see the remains deposited in the grave, but not returning to his house, before he set out.

John Borrowdale or Borrodil. It is a probable conjecture that he brought also an infant son with him. He is known to have had a son George, of whose birth or baptism no record is found on this side of the ocean. The elder Winthrop at this period calls him "a young soldier lately come out of the wars in England," whom the young men of Roxbury wished to choose for their captain; but "the ancient and chief men of the town," gathered together, out-voted them and prevented them from carrying their point.¹ Two children of George and Ann Denison are recorded in Roxbury, John, born June 14th, 1646; Ann, May 20th, 1649.²

In 1651, we find George Denison among the planters at Pequot, where he took up a house lot, built a house and engaged in public affairs. In 1654 he removed to a farm, on the east side of Mystic River, then within the bounds of the same plantation, but afterward included in Stonington. In 1670 he had three children baptized by Mr. Bradstreet, William, Margaret and Borradil, which makes his number eight. On the old town book of Stonington is recorded the death of Mary, daughter of George Denison, Nov. 10th, 1670-1. This, we suppose to have been a ninth child, who died an infant.

Our early history presents no character of bolder and more active spirit than Capt. Denison. He reminds us of the border men of Scotland. Though he failed in attaining the rank of captain, at Roxbury, yet in our colony, he was at his first coming greeted with the title, and was very soon employed in various offices of trust and honor—such as commissioner, and deputy to the General Court. When the plantation of Mystic and Pawkatuck, was severed from New London and placed under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts with the name of Southerton, the chief management of affairs was intrusted to him.

Yet notwithstanding Capt Denison's position as a magistrate and legislator, we do not always find him in the strict path of law and order. He had frequent disputes and lawsuits; he brought actions

¹ Savage's Winthrop, vol. 2, p. 807.

² These dates from the Roxbury records were communicated by James Savage, Esq., of Boston, who observes that Margaret, the third wife of Rev. Thomas Shepard of Cambridge, and after his death the wife of his successor, Rev. Jonathan Mitchell, bore the family name of Borrowdale, and was probably sister to Mrs. Ann Denison. As these two females are the only persons known in the new world of the name, their consanguinity can scarcely be doubted.

for slander and defamation against several of his neighbors, and was himself arraigned for violations of existing laws.

He was, however, encompassed with difficulties. The young town of which he was one of the conspicuous founders was convulsed by territorial and jurisdictional claims and he could not be loyal to two governments at once. If he obeyed one, he must of course be stigmatized as a rebel to the other.

As a magistrate of Massachusetts he performed the marriage rite for William Measure and Alice Tinker, and was immediately prosecuted by Connecticut for an illegal act, and heavily fined. As a friend to the Indians and an agent of the commissioners of the United Colonies, he was in favor of allowing them to remain in their customary hamlets by the sea, and haunts upon the neighboring hills; but the other authorities of the town and colony, were bent upon driving them back, to settle among the primeval forests. This of course, led to contention.

The will of George Denison dated Nov. 20th, 1693, was exhibited and proved in the county court, in June, 1695.¹ The children named in its provisions were three sons—George, John and William, and five daughters—Sarah Stanton, Hannah Saxton, Ann Palmer, Margaret Brown, and Borradil Stanton.

George Denison the second, became an inhabitant of Westerly, a town comprising the tract so long in debate between the king's province and Connecticut colony. He had three sons, George, Edward and Joseph.

John Denison married Phebe Lay, of Saybrook. The parental contract between Capt. George and Mrs. Ann Denison on the one part, and Mr. Robert Lay on the other, for the marriage of their children, John Denison and Phebe Lay, is recorded at Saybrook, but bears no date.

William the third son of Capt. George, inherited the paternal homestead in Stonington.

George Denison, son of John, of Stonington, and grandson of Capt. George, (born March 28th, 1671,) graduated at Harvard College, in 1693, and settled as an attorney in New London, where he married (1694) Mary, daughter of Daniel Wetherell, and relict of Thomas Harris. The family of this George Denison belongs to New London, but it can not be here displayed in detail. He had two sons, Daniel and Wetherell, and six daughters. The latter, as they grew

¹ The original will is not on file in the probate office, but is supposed to be extant.

up, were esteemed the flower of the young society of the place. They married Edward Hallam, Gibson Harris, John Hough, Jonathan Latimer, Samuel Richards, and William Douglas.

In 1698, George Denison was chosen clerk of the county court, and at the time of his death, January 20th, 1719-20, was recorder of the town and clerk of probate. His signature so often recurring on the files and books of the town, may appropriately be represented here.



Robert Denison, brother of the last named, (born September 17th, 1673,) purchased a tract of Indian land in 1710, near the north-west corner of New London. It lay upon Mashipaug (Gardiner's) Lake where the bounds of Norwich, New London and Colchester, came together. At what period he removed his family thither is not known, but probably about 1712. He is known to the records as Capt. Robert Denison, of the North Parish, and died about 1737. His son Robert served in the French wars during several campaigns, was a captain in Wolcott's brigade, at the taking of Louisburg, and afterward promoted to the rank of major. Being a man of stalwart form and military bearing, he was much noticed by the British officers, with whom he was associated. He married Deborah, daughter of Matthew Griswold, 2d, of Lyme, and in 1760, removed with most of his family to Nova Scotia.

Peter Spicer, died probably in 1695.

He was one of the resident farmers in that part of the township which is now Ledyard. We find him a landholder in 1666. The inventory of his estate was presented to the judge of probate, by his wife Mary, in 1695. From her settlement of the estate, it appears that the children were, Edward, Samuel, Peter, William, Joseph, Abigail, Ruth, Hannah and Jane. Capt. Abel Spicer, of the Revolutionary army, was from this family.

John Leeds, died probably in 1696.

The following extracts from the town and church records, contain all the information that has been gathered of the family of John Leeds.

“ John Leeds, of Staplehowe, in Kent, Old England, was married to Elizabeth, daughter of Cary Latham, June 25th, 1678.”

"Mr. Leeds' child John, baptized March 13th, 1690-1.

" " daughter Elizabeth, baptized October 16th, 1691.

" " son William, baptized May 20th, 1693.

Widow Leeds' two children baptized, Gideon and Thomas, August 1st, 1697."

John Leeds is first introduced to us in 1674, as a mariner, commander of the *Success*, bound to Nevis. He engaged afterward in building vessels, and had a ship-yard on the east side of the river.

John Mayhew, died 1696.

This name appears after 1670, belonging to one of that class of persons who had their principal home on the deep, and their rendezvous in New London.

"John Mayhew, from Devonshire, Old England, mariner, was married unto Johanna, daughter of Jeffrey Christophers, December 26th, 1676."

Children of John Mayhew.

1. John, born December 15th, 1677.
2. Wait, born October 4th, 1680.
3. Elizabeth, born February 8th, 1683-4.
4. Joanna ; 5. Mary ; 6. Patience : these three were baptized July 9th, 1693.

Wait Mayhew, the second son, died in 1707, without issue. John Mayhew, 2d, was a noted ship-master in the West India and Newfoundland trade, and attended the sea expedition against Canada, in 1711, in the capacity of a pilot. The next year he was sent to England to give his testimony respecting the disastrous shipwrecks in the St. Lawrence, that frustrated the expedition. He died in 1727, leaving several children, but only one son, John, who died without issue, in 1745. The Mayhew property was inherited by female descendants of the names of Talman, Lanpheer and Howard.

John Plumbe,¹ died in 1696.

Plumbe is one of the oldest names in Connecticut. Mr. John Plumbe was of Wethersfield, 1636, and a magistrate in 1637.² He had a warehouse burnt at Saybrook, in the Pequot War. In February, 1664-5, he was appointed inspector of the lading of vessels at Wethersfield.³ He was engaged in the coasting trade, and his name

¹ This is his own orthography; on the colonial records it is Plum.

² Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 18.

³ *Ut supra*, p. 121.

incidentally appears in the records of various towns on the river, and along the coast of the Sound. An account has been preserved among the Winthrop papers of a remarkable meteor which he saw one night in October, 1665. "I being then (he observes) rowing in my bote to groton,"¹ probably from Seabrook, where his account is dated. In 1670 he is noticed as carrying dispatches between Governors Winthrop, of Hartford, and Lovelace, of New York.² We have no account of him at New London, as an inhabitant of the town, until he was chosen constable, in February, 1679-80. He was afterward known as marshal of the county and innkeeper. He had three children baptized in New London: Mercy, in 1677; George, in 1679, and Sarah, in 1682. But he had other children much older than these, viz., John, Samuel, Joseph and Greene. Samuel and Joseph settled in Milford; John, was at first of Milford, but afterward of New London, and for many years a deacon of the church. Greene also settled in New London; George, in Stonington.

Joseph Truman, died in 1697.

Joseph Truman came to New London in 1666, and was chosen constable the next year. Truman's Brook and Truman Street are names derived from him and his family. He had a tannery at each end of this street, on Truman's Brook and the brook which ran into Bream Cove, near the Hempstead lot. In his will, executed in September, 1696, he mentions four children: Joseph, Thomas, Elizabeth and Mary. Neither his marriage, nor the births of his children are in the town registry.

Joseph and Jonathan Rogers.

These were the second and fifth sons of James Rogers, Senior, and are supposed to have died in 1697, at the respective ages of fifty-one and forty-seven, both leaving large families. The other three sons of James Rogers lived into the next century.

Samuel Rogers died December 1st, 1713, aged seventy-three.

James Rogers " November 8th, 1713, aged sixty-three.

John Rogers " October 17th, 1721, aged seventy-three.

¹ Mass. Hist. Coll., 8d series, vol. 10, p. 57. This is the earliest instance that has been observed of the application of the name *Groton*, to the east side of the river. Probably it was first used to designate Winthrop's farm at Pequonuck.

² *U* *supra*, p. 79.

Ebenezer Hubbell, died in 1698.

A brief paragraph will contain all our information of this person. He was a native of Stratfield, in Fairfield county, married Mary, daughter of Gabriel Harris, and purchased the homestead of Samson Haughton, (corner of Truman and Blinman Streets.) He had a daughter Elizabeth, born in 1693, and a son Ebenezer, in 1695. His relict married Ebenezer Griffing. The son Ebenezer, died in 1720, probably without issue.

The Beeby¹ brothers.

The phrase "John Beeby and his brothers," used in the early grants to the family, leads to the supposition that John was the oldest of the four. They may be arranged with probability in the order of John, Thomas, Samuel and Nathaniel. They all lived to advanced age.

1. John Beeby married Abigail, daughter of James Yorke, of Stonington. He had three children—John, Benjamin and a daughter Rebecca, who married Richard Shaw, of Easthampton. No other children can be traced. He was for several years sergeant of the train-band, but in 1690 was advanced to the lieutenancy, and his brother Thomas chosen sergeant. No allusion has been found that can assist in fixing the period of his death. His relict died March 9th, 1725, aged eighty-six or eighty-seven. The annalist who records it, observes, "Her husband was one of the first settlers of this town."

2. Thomas Beeby's wife was Millicent, daughter of William Addis, he being her third husband. The two former were William Ash and William Southmead, both of Gloucester; though Southmead had formerly lived in Boston, and owned a tenement there.² Ash and Southmead were probably both mariners or coast traders. Two sons belonged to the second marriage, William and John Southmead, who came with their mother to New London. Of their ages no estimate can be formed. They became mariners, and their names occur only incidentally. Of John we lose sight in a short time. William is supposed to have settled ultimately in Middletown.

¹ The brothers wrote the name indifferently Beebee and Beeby. The autograph sometimes varies on the same page.

² It was sold in 1668, by Thomas and Millicent Beeby, for the benefit of the sons of William and Millicent Southmead. Savage, (MS.)

The children of Thomas and Millicent Beeby, were one son, Thomas, who lived to old age, but was a cripple and never married ; Millicent, wife of Nicholas Darrow ; Hannah, wife of John Hawke, and Rebecca, wife of Nathaniel Holt. Sergeant Thomas Beeby died in the early part of 1699. His homestead descended to his son Thomas, by whom it was conveyed in the latter part of his life, to his nephew, William Holt.

3. Samuel Beeby, in a deposition of 1708, states his age at seventy-seven, and says, " I came to this town nearly sixty years ago." He died in 1712, leaving a wife, Mary. His former wife was Agnes or Annis, daughter of William Keeny. Whether the children all belonged to the first wife, or should be distributed between the two is doubtful. They were Samuel, William, Nathaniel, Thomas, Jonathan, Agnes, (wife of John Daniels,) Ann, (wife of Thomas Crocker,) Susannah, (wife of Aaron Fountain,) Mary, (wife of Richard Tozor.) William Beeby, one of the sons of Samuel, married Ruth, daughter of Jonathan Rogers, and was a member of the Sabbatarian community on the Great Neck. Jonathan, probably the youngest son, and born about 1676, was an early settler of East Haddam, where he was living in 1750.

Samuel Beeby, second, oldest son of Samuel the elder, obtained in his day a considerable local renown. He married (February 9th, 1681-2) Elizabeth, daughter of James Rogers, and in right of his wife, as well as by extensive purchases of the Indians, became a great landholder. He was one of three who owned Plum Island, in the Sound, and living upon the island in plentiful farmer style, with sloops and boats for pleasure or traffic at his command, he was often sportively called " King Beebee," and " Lord of the Islands." A rock in the sea, not far from his farm, was called " Beebee's throne." Plum Island is an appanage of Southold, Suffolk county, Long Island, and Mr. Beeby, by removing to that island, transferred himself to the jurisdiction of New York.

4. Nathaniel Beeby, supposed to be the youngest of the four brothers, settled in Stonington. His land was afterward absorbed in the large estates of his neighbors, the Denisons. In the will of William Denison, (1715,) he disposes of the Beeby land, but adds, " I order my executors to take a special care of Mr. Nathaniel Beeby during his life, and to give him a Christian burial at his death." Accordingly we find the gravestone of this venerable man, near that of the Denisons. The inscription states that he died December 17th, 1724, aged ninety-three. Estimating from the given data, the births of

Samuel and Nathaniel Beeby would both come within the verge of 1681. It is probable that Samuel's was in 1630 and Nathaniel's in 1632.

William Chapman, died December 18th, 1699.

This name first appears in 1657, when William Chapman bought the Denison house-lot on the present Hempstead Street, nearly opposite the jail. No record is found of his family. The children named in his will, were John, William, Samuel, Jeremiah, Joseph, Sarah and Rebecca.

John Chapman, by supposition named as the oldest son, removed in 1706, with his family, to Colchester, where he was living in May, 1748, when it was observed that "he would be ninety-five years old next November." We may therefore date his birth in November, 1653.

William Chapman married Hannah, daughter of Daniel Lester, and is supposed to have settled in Groton.

Samuel Chapman is the ancestor of the Waterford family of Champs. He lived in the Cohanzie district, reared to maturity nine children, and died November 2d, 1758, aged ninety-three. Before his death he conveyed his homestead to his grandson, Nathaniel.

Joseph Chapman was a mariner. He removed his family to Norwich, where he died June 10th, 1725.

Jeremiah Chapman, probably the youngest of the five brothers, retained the family homestead. He died September 6th, 1755, aged eighty-eight. All the brothers left considerable families, and their posterity is now widely dispersed.

Stephen Loomer, died in 1700.

This name is not found in New London before 1687. Mr. Loomer's wife was a daughter of George Miller. His children, and their ages at the time of his death, were as follows: John, sixteen; Mary, thirteen; Martha, eleven; Samuel, eight; Elizabeth, five. In following out the fortunes of the family, we find that John, the oldest son, was a seaman, and probably perished by storm or wreck, as in 1715, he had not been heard from for several years. Mary, relict of Stephen Loomer, married in 1701, Caleb Abel, of Norwich, and this carried the remainder of the family to that place.

David Carpenter, died in 1700.

The period of his settlement in the town was probably coincident with his marriage to Sarah, daughter of William Hough—to both events the conjectural date of 1676 may be assigned. Mr. Carpenter lived at Niantic Ferry, of which he had a lease from Edward Palmes. He left an only son, David, baptized Nov. 12th, 1682, and several daughters. His relict married William Stevens, of Killingworth.

Alexander Pygan, died in 1701.

On his first arrival in the plantation, Mr. Pygan appears to have been a lawless young man, of "passionate and distempered carriage," as it was then expressed; one who we may suppose "left his country for his country's good." But the restraints and influences with which he was here surrounded, produced their legitimate effect, and he became a discreet and valuable member of the community.

Alexander Pygan, of Norwich, Old England, was married unto Judith, daughter of William Redfin, (Redfield,) June 17th, 1667.

Children.

1. Sarah, born Feb. 23d, 1669-70; married Nicholas Halfam.
2. Jane, " Feb., 1670-1; married Jonas Green.

Mrs. Judith Pygan died April 30th, 1678.

After the death of his wife, Mr. Pygan dwelt a few years at Saybrook, where he had a shop of goods, and was licensed by the county court as an innkeeper. Here also he married an estimable woman, Lydia, relict of Samuel Boyes, April 15th, 1684. Only one child was the issue of this marriage.

3. Lydia, born Jan. 10th, 1684-5; married Rev. Eliphilet Adams. Samuel Boyes, the son of Mrs. Lydia Pygan, by her first husband, was born Dec. 6th, 1673.

Mr. Pygan soon returned with his family to New London, where he died in the year 1701. He is the only person of the family name of Pygan, that the labor of genealogists has as yet brought to light in New England. His relict, Mrs. Lydia Pygan, died July 20th, 1734. She was the daughter of William and Lydia Bemont, of Saybrook, and born March 9th, 1644.¹

¹ Her mother is said to have been a *Danforth*; perhaps daughter of Nicholas Danforth, of Boston.

Thomas Stedman, died in 1701.

This name is found at New London, at the early date of 1649, but it soon afterward disappears. In 1666, Thomas Stedman is again on the list of inhabitants, living near Niantic River. He married (Aug. 6th, 1668) Hannah, daughter of Robert Isbell, and step-daughter to William Nicholls. They had two children, John, born Dec. 25th, 1669, and Ann, who married Benjamin Lester. John left descendants.

Thomas Stedman, of New London, was brother of Lieut. John Stedman, of Wethersfield, who, in 1675, was commander of a company of sixty dragoons, raised in Hartford county. The following letter on record at New London, is evidence of this connection :

“Loving brother Thomas Stedman.

“My love to yourself and your little ones, my cousins, and to Uncle Nicholls and to Aunt and to the rest of my friends, certifying you that through God’s mercy and goodness to us, we are in reasonable good health.

“Brother, These are to get you to assist my son in selling or letting my house which I bought of Benjamin Atwell, and what you shall do in that business I do firmly bind myself to confirm and ratify. As witness my hand this last day of October, 1672, from Wethersfield.”

Extracted out of the original letter under the hand of John Stedman, Sen.

Butler.

Thomas and John Butler are not presented to our notice as inhabitants of New London, until after 1680. Probably they were brothers. No account of the marriage or family of either is on record.

“Thomas Butler died Dec. 20th, 1701, aged fifty-nine.

John Butler died March 28th, 1733, aged eighty.

Katherine, wife of John Butler, died Jan. 24th, 1728-9, aged sixty-seven. She was a daughter of Richard Haughton,

Allan Mullins, chirurgeon, son of Doctor Alexander Mullins, of Galway, Ireland, was married to Abigail, daughter of John Butler, of New London, April 8th, 1725.”

Thomas Butler’s family can not be given with certainty, but nothing appears to forbid the supposition that Lieutenant Walter Butler, a prominent inhabitant about 1712, and afterward, was his son. Walter Butler married Mary, only child of Thomas Harris, and granddaughter of Capt. Daniel Wetherell. The date of the marriage has not been recovered.

Children.

1. Mary, born Aug. 29th, 1714.
4. Jane, bap. July 10th, 1720.
2. Thomas, " Jan. 31st, 1715-16.
5. Katherine, " Aug. 26th, 1722.
3. Walter, " May 27th, 1718.
6. Lydia, " Jan. 10th, 1724-5.

Lieut. Butler married, in 1727, Deborah, relict of Ebenezer Dennis, and had a son, John, baptized April 28th, 1728.

The name of Walter Butler is associated with the annals of Tryon county, New York, as well as with New London. He received a military appointment in the Mohawk country, in 1728, and fourteen years later removed his family thither. Mr. Hempstead makes an entry in his diary :

" Nov. 6th, 1742, Mrs. Butler, wife of Capt. Walter Butler, and her children and family, is gone away by water to New York, in order to go to him in the Northern Countries, above Albany, where he hath been several years Captain of the Forts."

Capt. Butler was the ancestor of those Colonels Butler, John and Walter, who were associated with the Johnsons as royalists in the commencement of the Revolutionary War.¹ The family, for many years, continued to visit, occasionally, their ancient home.²

Very few of the descendants of Thomas and John Butler, are now found in this vicinity ; but the hills and crags have been charged to keep their name, and they have hitherto been faithful to their trust. In the western part of Waterford, is a sterile, hard-favored district, with abrupt hills, and more stone and rock than soil, which is locally called *Butler-town*—a name derived from this ancient family of Butlers.

Capt. Samuel Fosdick, died August 27th, 1702.

Samuel Fosdick, "from Charlestown, in the Bay," appears at New London about 1680. According to manuscripts preserved in the family, he was the son of John Fosdick and Anna Shapley, who were married in 1648 ; and the said John was a son of Stephen Fosdick, of Charlestown, who died May 21st, 1664.

1 See Annals of Tryon Co. and Barber's New York Coll. In the latter work is a view of Butler House.

2 It was probably through the prompting of the Butlers, that Sir Wm. Johnson and his son, afterward resorted to New London for recreation and the sea-breeze. One of these visits is noticed in the *Gazette*, May 4th, 1767. " Sir Wm. Johnson, Bart., arrived in town, for the benefit of the sea air, and to enjoy some relaxation from Indian affairs. June 18, arrived Sir John Johnson, Col. Croghan and several other gentlemen from Fort Johnson."

"Samuel, son of John Fosdick, of Charlestown, New England, married Mercy, daughter of John Picket, of New London, Nov. 1, 1682." They had children :

1. Samuel, born Sept. 18th, 1684.	5. John, born Feb. 1st, 1693-4.
2. Mercy, " Nov. 30th, 1686.	6. Thomas, " Aug. 20th, 1696.
3. Ruth, " June 27th, 1689.	7. Mary, " July 7th, 1699.
4. Anna, " Dec. 8th, 1691.	

Mercy, relict of Samuel Fosdick, married John Arnold.

Capt. Samuel Fosdick was one of the owners of Plum Island, and had thereon a farm under cultivation, well stocked and productive. His residence in town was on what was then often called Fosdick's Neck, (now Shaw's.) He also possessed, in right of his wife, that part of the Picket lot, which was subsequently purchased by Capt. Nathaniel Shaw. Another house-lot, owned by him on the bank, comprising nearly the whole block between Golden and Tilley Streets, was estimated, in the list of his estate, at only £30. It then lay vacant, but afterward became the valuable homestead of his youngest son, Thomas, and his descendants. A glance at the inventory of Capt. Fosdick, will show the ample and comfortable style of house-keeping, to which the inhabitants had attained in 1700. Five feather beds, one of them with a suit of red curtains; twenty pair of sheets; sixteen blankets; three silk blankets; three looking-glasses; three large brass kettles; two silver cups, and other articles in this proportion, are enumerated. But there are also certain implements mentioned, the fashion of which has with time passed away, viz., four wheels; twelve pewter basins; two dozen pewter porringers, &c. The matrons of those days took as much delight in a well-arranged dresser, and its rows of shining pewter, with perhaps here and there a spoon, a cup, or a tankard of silver interspersed, as they now do in sideboards of mahogany or rose-wood, and services of plate.

Samuel, the oldest son of Capt. Samuel Fosdick, removed to Oyster Bay, Long Island, where he was living in 1750. John, the second son, went to Guilford. Thomas, remained in New London, and is best known on record as Deacon Thomas Fosdick. He married, June 29th, 1720, Esther, daughter of Lodowick Updike.

The daughters of Capt. Samuel Fosdick were also widely scattered by marriage. Mercy, married Thomas Jiggles, of Boston; Ruth, an Oglesby of New York; Anna, Thomas Latham, of Groton, and Mary, Richard Sutton, of Charlestown.

Joseph Pemberton, died Oct. 14th, 1702.

James Pemberton had a son, Joseph, born in Boston in 1655,¹ with whom we venture to identify the Joseph Pemberton, here noticed. He resided in Westerly, before coming to New London. His relict, Mary, removed to Boston, with her sons James and Joseph. Two married daughters were left in New London, Mary, wife of Alexander Baker, and Elizabeth, wife of Jonathan Rogers, both of the north parish, (now Montville.)

William Walworth,² died in 1703.

William Walworth is first known to us as the lessee of Fisher's Island, or of a considerable part of it; and it is a tradition of the family that he came directly from England to assume this charge, at the invitation of the owner of the island, Fitz-John Winthrop, who wished to introduce the English methods of farming. William Walworth and his wife owned the covenant, and were baptized with their infant child, Martha, Jan. 24th, 1691-2. Their children, at the time of the father's decease, were Martha, Mary, John, Joanna, Thomas and James, the last two twins, and all between the ages of two and twelve years. Abigail, relict of William Walworth, died Jan. 14th, 1751-2; having been forty-eight years a widow. This was certainly an uncommon instance for an age, renowned not only for *early*, but for hasty, frequent, and late marriages.

John Walworth, second son of William, had also a lease of Fisher's Island, for a long term of years. He died in 1748. His inventory mentions four negro servants, a herd of near fifty horned cattle, eight hundred and twelve sheep, and a stud of thirty-two horses, mares and colts. He had also seventy-seven ounces of wrought plate, and other valuable household articles. It has been the fortune of Fisher's Island, to enrich many of its tenants, especially in former days. Not only the Walworths, but the Mumfords and Browns, drew a large income from the lease of the island. From John Walworth, descended the person of the same name, who commenced the settlement of Painesville, Ohio, and at the period of his death, in 1812, was collector of customs in Cleveland, Ohio.

R. H. Walworth, Esq., of Saratoga, is a descendant from William, the oldest son of William and Abigail Walworth.

¹ Farmer's Register.

² On early records the name is sometimes Walsworth and Allsworth.

Edward Stallion, died May 14th, 1703.

When this person made his first appearance in the plantation, Mr. Bruen, the clerk, recorded his name *Stanley*. It was soon altered to *Stallion*, or Stallon. In later times it has been identified with *Sterling*, which may have been the true name.

Edward Stallion was at first a coasting trader, but later in life became a resident farmer in North Groton, (now Ledyard.) His children are only named incidentally, and the list obtained is probably incomplete. Deborah, wife of James Avery, Jr., Sarah, wife of John Edgecombe, and Margaret, wife of Pasco Foote, were his daughters. His first wife, Margaret, died after 1680. He married in 1685, Elizabeth, daughter of George Miller, by whom he had two children, names not mentioned. In 1698, he married, a third time, Christian, relict of Wm. Chapell, who survived him. He left a son, Edward, probably one of the two children by the second wife, who, in 1720, was of Preston, and left descendants there. The death of Edward Stallion, Sen., was the result of an accident, which is sufficiently detailed in the following verdict :

"Wee the Subscribers being impaneld and sworne on a jury of inquest to view the body of Edward Stallion—have accordingly viewed the corpse and according to the best of our judgments and by what information wee have had doe judge that he was drowned by falling out of his Canno the 14th day of this instant and that hee had noe harm from any person by force or violence. New London May y^e 31, 1703.

Joseph Latham	Wm. Potts
Wm Thorne (his mark. T.)	John Bayley
Andrew Lester	Joshua Bill
Phillip Bill	Jonathan Lester
Gershom Rice	James Morgan
	Wm Swadle
	John Williams."

Though dated at *New London*, this jury was impaneled in that part of the township which is now Ledyard, and the names belong to that place and Groton. The town had not then been divided.

Ezekiel Turner, died January 16th, 1703-4.

He was a son of John Turner of Scituate, and grandson of Humphrey Turner, an emigrant of 1628. His mother was Mary, daughter of Jonathan Brewster. At New London we have no account of him earlier than his marriage with Susannah, daughter of John Keeny, Dec. 26th, 1678. He left one son Ezekiel, and a band of ten daughters, the youngest an infant at the time of his decease. His neighbor,

Oliver Manwaring, had two sons and eight daughters of nearly coincident ages, and it was a common saying, that these two families had daughters enough to stock the town.

Ezekiel Turner, second, married Borradil Denison and settled in Groton. Elisha and Thomas Turner, supposed also to come from the Scituate family, settled in the town after 1720. From Thomas, who married Patience, daughter of John Bulles, (Nov. 23d, 1727,) most of the Turner families of New London and Montville are descended.

Jonathan Turner from South Kingston purchased in 1735, a farm upon the Great Neck (Waterford) and has also descendants in New London and its neighborhood.

Sergeant George Darrow, died in 1704.

From inferential testimony it is ascertained that George Darrow married Mary, relict of George Sharswood. The baptisms but not the births of their children are recorded:

1. Christopher, bap. Dec. 1st, 1678. 3. Nicholas, May 20th, 1683.
2. George, " Oct. 17th, 1680. 4. Jane, April 17th, 1692.

Mary, wife of George Darrow, died in 1698.

George Darrow and Elizabeth Marshall of Hartford were married Aug. 10th, 1702.

The above list comprises all the children recorded, but there may have been others. Christopher Darrow married Elizabeth Packer, a granddaughter of Cary Latham. In a corner of a field upon the Great Neck, on what was formerly a Darrow farm, is a group of four gravestones; one of them bears the following inscription:

"In memory of Mrs. Elizabeth Darrow, wife of Mr. Christopher Darrow, who died in February 1758, aged 78 years. She was mother to 8 children, 43 grand-children, 30 great grand-children. Has had 100" (descendants?)

Major Christopher Darrow, a brave soldier of the French and Revolutionary Wars, who lived in the North Parish, and Elder Zadok Darrow, a venerable Baptist minister of Waterford, were descendants of Christopher and Elizabeth Darrow.

George Sharswood.

Only flitting gleams are obtained of this person and his family. They come and go like figures exhibited for scenic effect. George Sharswood appears before us in 1666; is inserted in the rate list of

1667; the next year builds a house, and apparently about the same time becomes a married man, though of this event we can find no record. His children presented for baptism were, George and William, April 2d, 1671; Mary in 1672, and Katherine in 1674. Of his death there is no account; but before 1678, the relict had married George Darrow. The children being young, the estate was left unsettled, and in a few years, only William and Mary were living.

June 24th, 1700, William Sharswood "sometime of Cape May but now of New London," has the house and land of his father made over to him by a quitclaim deed from Sergt. George Darrow. The September following he has three children, Jonathan, George and Abigail, baptized by the Rev. Mr. Saltonstall. He then disappears from our sight.

In September, 1704, measures were instituted to settle the estate of the elder Sharswood, and in the course of the proceedings we learn that the daughter, Mary, was the wife of Jonathan Hill, and that William Sharswood, the son, had recently deceased in New Castle county Delaware.

In 1705, Abigail, relict of William Sharswood, was the wife of George Polly of Philadelphia. The estate in New London was not fully settled till 1724, nearly fifty years after the decease of George Sharswood. Jonathan Hill was the administrator, and the acquittances were signed by Abigail Polly and the surviving sons of William Sharswood—William, of Newcastle, and George and James, of Philadelphia.¹

John Harvey, died in January, 1705.

The name of John Harvey is first noticed about 1682. He was then living near the head of Niantic River, and perhaps within the bounds of Lyme. He left sons John and Thomas, and daughter Elizabeth Willey.

Williams.

No genealogy in New London county is more extensive and perplexing than that of Williams. The families of that name are derived from several distinct ancestors. Among them John Williams and Thomas Williams appear to stand disconnected; at least, no

¹ The present George Sharswood, Esq., of Philadelphia, is a descendant of George of New London.

relationship with their contemporaries has been traced, or with each other. They are entirely distinct from the Stonington family of Williams, although the names are in many cases identical.

The first *Williams* in New London was *William*, who is in the rate list of 1664. He lived on the east, or Groton side of the river, and died in 1704, leaving four sons, Richard, William, Henry and Stephen, all of full age, and a daughter Mary, wife of Samuel Packer.

Thomas Williams appears in the plantation, about 1670. His cattle mark was enrolled in 1680. He lived west of the river at or near Mohegan, and died Sept. 24th, 1705, about sixty-one years of age. He left a widow Joanna and eleven children, between the ages of twelve and thirty-three years, and a grandchild who was heir of a deceased daughter. The sons were John, Thomas, Jonathan, William, Samuel and Ebenezer.

John Williams, another independent branch of this extended name, married in 1685 or 1686, Jane, relict of Hugh Hubbard and daughter of Cary Latham. No trace of him earlier than this has been noticed. He succeeded to the lease of the ferry, (granted for fifty years to Cary Latham,) and lived, as did also his wife, to advanced age. "He kept the ferry," says Hempstead's diary, "when Groton and New London were one town, and had but one minister, and one captain's company." When he died, Dec. 3d, 1741, within the same bounds were eight religious societies, and nine military companies, five on the west side and four in Groton. He left an only son, Peter, of whom Capt. John Williams who perished in the massacre at Groton fort in 1781, was a descendant.

John and Eleazar Williams, brother and son of Isaac Williams, of Roxbury, Mass., settled in Stonington about the year 1687, and are the ancestors of another distinct line, branches of which have been many years resident in New London and Norwich. The genealogy of this family belongs more particularly to Stonington.

Ebenezer Williams, son of Samuel of Roxbury, and cousin of John and Eleazar, settled also in Stonington, and left descendants there. He was brother of the Rev. John Williams, first minister of Deerfield, who was taken captive with his family by the French and Indians in 1701. A passage from Hempstead's diary avouches this relationship:

"Sept. 9, 1733. Mr. Ebenezer Williams of Stonington is come to see a French woman in town that says she is daughter to his brother the late Rev. Mr. Williams of Deerfield taken by the French and Indians thirty years ago."

This passage refers to a young daughter of the Deerfield family that was never redeemed from captivity, but lived and died among the Indians. She was probably often personated for sinister ends. The French woman mentioned above was unquestionably an impostor.

Capt. John Williams, of Poquetannock, (Ledyard,) was yet another original settler of the name. He is said to have come directly from Wales and to have had no relationship with other families in the country. We quote a cotemporary notice of his death:

"Jan. 12, 1741-2. Capt. John Williams died at Pockattonnock of pleurisy, after 7 days' illness. He was a good commonwealth's man, traded much by sea and land with good success for many years, and acquired wholly by his own industry a great estate. He was a very just dealer, aged about 60 years."¹

Brigadier-General Joseph Williams of Norwich, one of the Western Reserve purchasers, was a son of Capt. John Williams.

Benjamin Shapley, died August 3d, 1706.

Benjamin, son of Nicholas *Shapleigh* of Boston, was born, according to Farmer's Register, in 1645. We find no difficulty in appropriating this birth to Benjamin Shapley, mariner, who about 1670 became an inhabitant of New London. The facts which have been gathered respecting his family are as follows:

"Benjamin, son of Nicholas Shapley of Charlestown, married Mary, daughter of John Picket, April 10th, 1672."

Children.

1. Ruth, b. Dec. 24th, 1672—married John Morgan of Groton.
2. Benjamin, b. Mar. 20th, 1675—m. Ruth, daughter of Thomas Dymond.
3. Mary, b. Mar. 26th, 1677—married Joseph Truman.
4. Joseph, b. Aug. 15th, 1681—died young.
5. Ann, b. Aug. 31st, 1685—married Thomas Avery of Groton.
6. Daniel, b. Feb. 14th, 1689-90—m. Abigail Pierson of Killingworth.
7. Jane, b. —— 1696—married Joshua Appleton.
8. Adam, b. —— 1698—died young.

Mary, relict of Benjamin Shapley, died Jan. 15th, 1734-5. The Shapley house-lot was on Main Street, next north of the Christophers lot, and was originally laid out to Kempo Sybada, a Dutch captain. Shapley Street was opened through it in 1746. Captain Adam Shapley, who received his death wound at Fort Griswold, in 1781, was a descendant of Daniel Shapley.

¹ Hempstead, (MS.)

Anthony Ashby.

A person of this name kept a house of entertainment at Salem in 1670.¹ It was probably the same man that afterward came to New London, and settled east of the river. He was on the jury of the county court in 1690. His two daughters Mary and Hannah, united with the church in New London in 1694. His decease took place before 1708. Anthony Ashby, Jr., collector for the east side in 1696, died in 1712.

George Dennis.

The period of his death is uncertain, but it was previous to 1708. He came to New London from Long Island, and married Elizabeth, relict of Joshua Raymond. They had but one child, Ebenezer, who was born Oct. 23d, 1682. Ebenezer Dennis inherited from his mother a dwelling-house, choicely situated near the water, and commanding a fine prospect of the harbor, where about the year 1710 he opened a house of entertainment. His first wife was Sarah, daughter of Capt. John Hough, and his second, Deborah Ely of Lyme. He died in 1726; his relict the next year married Lieut. Walter Butler, and removed with him to the Indian frontier in the western part of New York. The family mansion was sold in 1728 to Matthew Stewart; it was where the Frink house now stands in Bank Street.

Mr. Dennis by his will left £25 to be distributed to the poor of the town. Among his effects 139 books are enumerated, which, though most of them were of small value, formed a considerable library for the time, probably the largest in the town.

Peter Crary, of Groton, died in 1708.

He married in December, 1677, Christobel, daughter of John Gallop. His oldest child, Christobel, was born "the latter end of Feb., 1678-9." Other children mentioned in his will were Peter, John, William, Robert, Margaret and Ann.

John Daniel, died about 1709.

This date is obtained by approximation: he was living in the early part of 1709, and in July, 1710, Mary, widow of John Daniels, is mentioned. His earliest date at New London is in April, 1668, when his name is given without the *s*, John Daniel.

John Daniel married Mary, daughter of George Chappell, Jan. 19th, 1664-5.
Children.

1. John, born Jan. 19th, 1665-6.	6. Rachel, born Feb. 27th, 1676.
2. Mary, " Oct. 12th, 1667.	7. Sarah, " Feb. 10th, 1679.
3. Thomas, " Dec. 31st, 1669.	8. Jonathan, " Oct. 15th, 1682.
4. Christian, " Mar. 3d, 1671.	9. Clement, (not recorded.)
5. Hannah, " Ap. 20th, 1674.	

Before his decease John Daniel divided his lands among his four sons, giving the homestead, adjoining the farms of John Keeny and Samuel Manwaring, to Thomas.

John Daniels, 2d, married Agnes Beeby, Dec. 3d, 1685. He died Jan. 15th, 1756, "wanting 15 days of 90 years old."¹ Thomas Daniels, the second son, died Oct. 12th, 1725. All the sons left descendants.²

George Chappell, died in 1709.

Among the emigrants for New England, in "the Christian," from London, 1635, was George Chappell, aged twenty.³ He was at Wethersfield, in 1637, and can be traced there as a resident until 1649,⁴ which was probably about the time that he came to Pequot, bringing with him a wife, Margaret, and some three or four children. Of his marriage, or of the births of these children, no account is preserved at Wethersfield. The whole list of his family, as gathered from various sources, is as follows :

1. Mary, married John Daniels.	6. Hester, born April 15th, 1662.
2. Rachel, married Thomas Crocker.	7. Sarah, " Feb. 14th, 1665-6.
3. John, removed to Flushing, L. I.	8. Nathaniel, " May 21st, 1668.
4. George, born March 5th, 1653-4.	9. Caleb, " Oct. 7th, 1671.
5. Elizabeth, born Aug. 30th, 1656.	

At the time of George Chappell's decease, these nine children were all living, as was also his aged wife, whom he committed to the special care of his son Caleb and grandson Comfort. Caleb Chap-

¹ By comparing this estimate with the date of his birth it will be seen that allowance is made for the change that had taken place in the style. His birth is given in O. S. and his death in N. S. According to the current date, only four days were wanting of ninety years.

² C. F. Daniels, the present editor of the *New London Daily and Weekly Chronicle*, is a descendant in the line of Thomas Daniels.

³ Savage's *Gleanings in Mass. Hist. Coll.*, 3d series, vol. 8, p. 252.

⁴ Conn. Col. Rec., vol. 1, p. 194.

pell had previously removed to Lebanon, from whence his son Amos went to Sharon, and settled in that part of the township which is now Ellsworth.¹ The second George Chappell married, first, Alice Way, and second, Mary Douglas. He had two sons, George and Comfort; from the latter, the late Capt. Edward Chappell, of New London, descended. Families of this name in New London and the neighboring towns, are numerous, all tracing back to George, for their ancestor. Branches from this stock are also disseminated in various parts of the Union.

Capt. Samuel Chester, died in 1710.

A sea-captain in the West India line, he receives his first grant of land in New London, for a warehouse, in 1664, in company with William Condy, of Boston, who was styled his nephew.² He subsequently removed to the east side of the river, where he dwelt at the time of his death. He was much employed in land surveys, and in 1693, was one of the agents appointed by the General Court to meet with a committee from Massachusetts, to renew and settle the boundaries between the two colonies. His children, baptized in New London, but births not recorded, were, John, Susannah and Samuel, in 1670; Mercy, 1673; Hannah, 1694, and Jonathan, 1697. His will, dated in 1708, mentions only Abraham, John, Jonathan and Mercy Burrows.

Mr. Chester had a large tract of land in the North Parish, bought of Owaneco and Josiah, Mohegan sachems. It is probable that one of his sons settled upon it, and that the Chester family, of Montville, are his descendants.

William Condy.

In connection with Capt. Chester, a brief notice is due to William Condy. His wife was Mary, daughter of Ralph Parker. He had four children presented together for baptism, March 23d, 1672-3—Richard, William, Ebenezer and Ralph. The family removed to Boston about 1680. A letter from Mr. Condy, dated June 14th, 1688, to Capt. Chester, is recorded at New London, requesting him to make

¹ Sedgwick's Hist. of Sharon, p. 72.

² This term like that of brother and cousin has a considerable range of application. Hugh Caulkins in a deed of gift to William Douglas who had married his granddaughter, and was no otherwise related to him, calls him *his nephew*.

sale of one hundred and fifty acres of land that had been given him by the town. He says :

"Loving uncle,

"I would desire if you can sell the land that lyeth on your side of the river to do me that kindness as to sell it for me at the best advantage, and send it down to me the next spring, and give a bill of sale for the same, and this shall be your discharge. If you sell it take it in pork if you can for that will be the best commodity here. I am now ready to sail for Barbadoes," &c.

The Condy family long retained a house-lot in town, which came to them from Ralph Parker. This estate was presented in the inventory of the second William Condy, in 1710, "late of Boston, but formerly of New London, where he was born," and was sold by a third William Condy, of Boston, in 1717.

Thomas Mortimer, died March 11th, 1709-10.

This name was often written Maltimore and Mortimore. We have little information concerning the person who bore it, and with whom, apparently, it became extinct. He was a constable in 1680. His wife, Elizabeth, survived him but a few months. The only persons mentioned as devisees or heirs, were two daughters—Mary, wife of Robert Stoddard, and Elizabeth, wife of Abraham Willey, and their children.

William Mynard, died in 1711.

This person was an original emigrant from Great Britain ; he had a brother George, who died at Fording Bridge, in Hampshire, England, to whose estate he was an heir. The name appears to have been originally identical with Maynard, and is often also confounded with Minor. William Mynard married Lydia Richards, Nov. 15th, 1678. They had a son, William, born Nov. 16th, 1680, but no other recorded. At his death, he is said to have wife, Lydia, and nine children, three of them under age. The names are not given, but the four brothers, William, George, David and Ionathan, (Mynard, Maynard, Mainer,) who were all householders about 1730, were probably sons of William and Lydia ; but the genealogy is obscured by the uncertainty of the name.

Zacharias Maynard, or Mayner, purchased a farm in 1697, near Robert Allyn and Thomas Rose, (in Ledyard.) His wife was a daughter of Robert Geer.

Thomas Pember,

Drowned, Sept. 27th, 1711, in Nahantic River, on whose banks he dwelt. He had three children baptized in 1692, viz., Mercy, Thomas and Elizabeth; also, Ann, baptized 1694, and John, 1696. At the period of his death, only four children were living. He left a wife, Agnes, who was for many years famous as a nurse and doctor. Of this kind of character, the changing customs of the age have scarcely left us a type. But tradition relates many vivid anecdotes respecting this energetic and experienced race of female practitioners. No medical man of the present day, can be more ready to answer a night-call—to start from sleep, mount a horse, and ride off six or seven miles in darkness or tempest, sustained by the hope of alleviating misery, than were these able nursing mothers of former times. A seventh daughter was particularly marked and set aside for the office, and unbounded confidence was placed in her skill to stroke for the king's evil, to cure cancers, alleviate asthma, and set bones.

Richard Singleton, died Oct. 16th, 1711.

The record of his death styles him *ferryman of Groton*. Originally he was a mariner, and probably took the ferry when the fifty years' lease of Latham expired, in 1705, in company with John Williams, or perhaps alternating with him. Both lived on Groton Bank and were lessees of the ferry about the same time. Mr. Singleton left nine children, of whom only Richard, William, Wait-Still and the wife of Samuel Latham are mentioned. His will directs that his children in Carolina and his children in Groton, should share equally in his estate, which however was small. Among the special bequests are, to his wife a negro man valued at £40; to son Richard the Church History of New England, £1; to William a large church Bible, "old England print," £1, 15s.; to Wait-Still two rods of land and a buccaneer gun.

Wells.

Thomas Wells was one of the early band of planters at Pequot Harbor; probably on the ground in 1648, and certainly in 1649. He was a carpenter, and worked with Elderkin, on mills and meeting-houses. The last notice of him on the town record is in 1661, when Wells and Elderkin were employed to repair the turret of the meeting-house. No account can be found of the sale of his house or

land. He may have left the settlement, or he may be concealed from our view by dwelling on a farm remote from the center of business.

A Thomas Wells—whether another or the same has not been ascertained—is found at Stonington or Westerly, about the year 1677, engaged in constructing vessels at a ship-yard on the Pawcatuck River. He is styled, “of Ipswich, shipwright.” In 1680, having a lawsuit with Amos Richardson, respecting a vessel of forty-eight tons burden, which he had contracted to build for him, two of his sons appeared as witnesses, viz., Joseph, aged twenty-two, and Thomas, seventeen.¹ Of Thomas Wells, we have no later information, but his fraternity to Joseph is thus established.

“*Joseph Wells*, of Groton, died October 26th, 1711.” We suppose this person to have been the noted ship-builder of Pawcatuck River, and that he is styled of Groton, from the circumstance of his having a farm and family residence near the head of Mystic, on the Groton side of the river. It is certain that a farm in this position, was occupied, at a very early period, by a Wells family. Descendants of the ancient owners, whom we suppose to have been first Thomas Wells, and then his son Joseph, are at this day (1850) living in the same place, and in the same low-browed, unaltered house, in the shadow of Porter’s Rocks, where Joseph Wells died. It is near a gap in the ledge where Mason and Underhill rested with their company a few hours, before making their terrible onslaught upon the Pequots, in the expedition of May, 1637. The will of Joseph Wells, executed five days before his decease, mentions wife Hannah, and children Joseph, John, Thomas and Anne.

Jacob Holloway, died Nov. 9th, 1711.

He appears in the plantation a little before 1700. Left a son, John, and daughters, Rose and Ann. His wife died four days after the decease of her husband.

Joseph Nest, died Dec. 8th, 1711.

Mr. Nest’s wife deceased before him, and he lived apparently alone, in a small tenement in the angle of the Lyme and Great Neck roads. Susannah, wife of George Way, appears to have been his daughter. No other relatives have been traced.

¹ Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

John Terrall, died Feb. 27th, 1712.

His wife, Mrs. Sarah Terrall, died March 7th, succeeding. No children are mentioned in the will of the latter, but she was probably a second wife.

Terrall should undoubtedly be written *Tyrrel*. Two persons of the name appear in New London, in the year 1662, William, a tailor, and John, a seaman. The former, probably, soon left the place. John Terrall is in the rate list of 1664. Of his family, there is no account, except a single entry upon the church record: "Goodman Tyrrell's two children, William and Mary, baptized May 7th, 1671.

John Wickwire, died in March or April, 1712.

This person was an early settler in Mohegan, or the North Parish, (now Montville.) Col. John Livingston was one of the executors named in his will. Madam Winthrop, (relict of Governor Fitz-John,) at her death, left legacies to "sister Wickwire's children."

John Wickwire married Mary, daughter of George and Margery Tongue, Nov. 6th, 1676.

Children.

1. George, born Oct. 4th, 1677.	5. Jonathan, born Feb. 19th, 1691.
2. Christopher, " Jan. 8th, 1679-80.	6. Peter, " Mar. 2d, 1694.
3. John, " Dec. 2d, 1685.	7. Ann, " Sept. 25th, 1697.
4. Elizabeth, " Mar. 23d, 1688-9.	

Thomas Short.

"Here lyeth the body of Thomas Short, who deceased Sept. 27th, 1712, aged thirty years." The small head-stone in the old burial-ground, which bears this inscription, shows where the remains of the first printer in the colony of Connecticut are deposited. He had been instructed in his art by Bartholomew Green, of Boston, who recommended him to the authorities of Connecticut, for a colony printer, in which office he established himself at New London, in 1709. In 1710, he issued "The Saybrook Platform of Church Discipline," the first book printed in the colony.¹ After this he printed sermons and pamphlets, and performed what public work the governor and company required, till death put an early stop to his labors. Two children of Thomas and Elizabeth Short, are recorded at New Lon-

¹ Thomas' History of Printing, vol. 1, p. 405.

don—Catharine, born in 1709; Charles in 1711. His relict married Solomon Coit, Aug. 8th, 1714.

Thomas Munsell, died in 1712.

We find this person mentioned in 1681. He was on a committee to lay out a highway in 1683. His wife was Lydia, and his children Jacob, Elisha, Mercy and Deliverance. In 1723, Jacob was of Windsor, and Elisha of Norwich.

Stephen Hurlbut, died October 7th, 1712.

The Hurlbut family, of Connecticut, commences with Thomas Hurlbut, who was one of the garrison at Saybrook Fort in 1636, and settled in Wethersfield about 1640. Stephen, who came to New London after 1690, was probably one of his descendants, and a native of Wethersfield. He married, about 1696, Hannah, daughter of Robert Douglas, and between 1697 and 1711, had seven children baptized—Stephen, Freelove, Mary, John, Sarah, Titus, Joseph. Stephen, the oldest son, died in 1725. John is the ancestor of the Ledyard family of Hurlbuts, and Joseph of that of New London. Capt. Titus Hurlbut was a man of considerable distinction in his day; he served in the French wars, and was a captain of the old fort that stood on the eastern border of the Parade, near the present ferry wharf. His descendants, in the male line, removed to the western states.

William Camp, died October 9th, 1713.

He was an inhabitant of the Jordan district. His wife was Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Smith. His two sons William and James removed to the North Parish, (now Montville.)

Hallam.

John and Nicholas Hallam were the sons of Mrs. Alice Liveen, by a former marriage, and probably born in Barbadoes—John in 1661, and Nicholas in 1664. John married Prudence, daughter of Amos Richardson, in 1682, and fixed his residence in Stonington, where he died in 1700. His possessions were large; a thousand acres of land were leased to him in perpetuity by John Richardson of Newbury in 1692 “for the consideration of five shillings and an

annual rent of one pepper-corn ;" and his inventory gives evidence of a style of dress and housekeeping, more expensive and showy than was common in those days. It contains silver plate, mantle and coat of *broadcloth*, lined with silk, "seventeen horse kind," four negro servants, &c.

"Nicholas Hallam married Sarah, daughter of Alexander Pygan, July 8, 1686. Children :

1. Alexander born Oct. 22, 1688.
2. Edward " Ap. 25, 1693, (married Grace Denison.)
3. Sarah " Mar. 29, 1695, (married Joseph Merrills.)

(Mrs. Sarah Hallam died in the year 1700.)

Nicholas Hallam was married Jan. 2, 1700-1 to widow Elizabeth Meades whose maiden name was Gulliver, in Bromley church, on the backside of Bow without Stepney church, in London, Old England. Their daughter Elizabeth was born in the parish of St. John Wapping, near Wapping New Stairs, in London Feb. 22, 1701-2, (married Samuel Latimer.)

5. Mary born in New London Oct. 11, 1705, (married Nathaniel Hempstead and Joseph Truman.)

6. John born Aug. 3, 1708, (married Mary Johnson.)"

Mr. Hallam's gravestone states that he died Sept. 18th, 1714, at the age of forty-nine years, five months and twenty-nine days. His wife survived him twenty-one years.

At this period, many families in town owned slaves, for domestic service; some but one, others two or three; very few more than four. The inventory of Nicholas Hallam comprises "a negro man named Lonnion," valued at £30; his wife disposes of her "negro woman Flora, and girl Judith." Among the family effects are articles that were probably brought from England, when Hallam returned with his English wife in 1703—such as *a clock and secretary*. Mrs. Hallam bequeaths to one of her daughters a diamond ring, and a chest made of Bermuda cedar; to another, "the hair-trunk I brought from London, and my gold chaine necklace containing seven chaines and a locket."

Alexander Hallam died abroad. The will of his father contains a bequest to him "if he be living and return home within twenty years." In 1720 his inventory was presented for probate with the label, *supposed to be dead*. Edward Hallam was town-clerk from December, 1720, to his death in 1736.¹

¹ Rev. Robert A. Hallam, rector of St. James' Church, New London, is the only surviving male descendant of Nicholas Hallam, in the line of the name.

Major Edward Palmes, died March 21st, 1714-15.

The same day died Capt. John Prentis, 2d. They were both buried on the 23d, under arms; Capt. Prentis in the morning and Major Palmes in the afternoon. The latter died on his farm at Nahantick, but was brought into town for interment. Mr. Hempstead's diary notices the extreme severity of the weather at the time, and says of Major Palmes—"He was well and dead in two hours and a half." His gravestone states that he was in his seventy-eighth year; we may therefore place his birth in the year 1638.

Guy and Edward Palmes were both traders in 1659 and 1660; the latter in New Haven, and the former in one of the towns west of it upon the Sound. In December, 1660, Edward had removed to New London. From various sources it is ascertained that he married Lucy Winthrop, daughter of Governor Winthrop of Connecticut, and after her death a Widow Davis, and that by his first wife he had a daughter Lucy, who married (first) Samuel Gray, and (second) Samuel Lynde of Saybrook; but of these successive events no explicit documentary evidence is to be found in New London. Dates therefore can not be given. Two children of Major Palmes by his second wife, are on Mr. Bradstreet's record of baptisms:

"Baptized Nov. 17, 1678, Major Palmes his child by his second wife who was Capt. Davis his relict, ——Guy..

"Baptized Oct. 1, 1682, Major Palmes his child — Andrew."

The Bentworth farm of Major Palmes at Nahantick was mortgaged to Capt. Charles Chambers of Charlestown for £853. He left, however, five other valuable farms. The Winthrop homestead in the town plot, and the Mountain farm, bought of Samuel Royce, he gave to his daughter Lucy Gray, but the remainder of his estate went to his son Andrew. These are the only children mentioned in his will, and probably all that survived infancy.

Andrew Palmes graduated at Harvard College in 1703, and died in 1721. He had four sons, Guy, Bryan, Edward and Andrew, and a daughter Sarah, who married Richard Dursey. The name of Palmes is now extinct in New London. The Brainerd family is descended in the female line from Capt. Edward Palmes, the third son of Andrew.

Richard Jennings, died Dec. 12th, 1715.

Richard Jennings and Elizabeth Reynolds were married "the beginning of June, 1678." They were both emigrants from Barbadoes.

Their children were, first, Samuel, born March 11th, 1679; second, Richard, 1680; third, Elinor, who married Richard Manwaring.

Thomas Crocker, died Jan. 18th, 1715-6.

The descendants of this person are numerous and widely scattered. At the time of his decease he was eighty-three years of age and had lived about fifty years in the town. His wife, Rachel, was a daughter of George Chappell. Their children were:

1. Mary, b. Mar. 4th, 1668-9.	4. Samuel, b. July 27th, 1676.
2. Thomas, b. Sept. 1st, 1670.	5. William, —— 1680.
3. John, —— 1672.	6. Andrew, —— 1683.

The second Thomas Crocker lived to the age of his father, eighty-three years and seven months. William Crocker, the fourth son, was a resolute partisan officer in the frontier wars, during the earlier part of the eighteenth century, and was styled "captain of the scouts." John Crocker of the third generation (son of John,) was also a soldier of the French wars, and their victim. He came home from the frontier sick, and died soon afterward, Nov. 30th, 1746, aged forty.

David Caulkins, died Nov. 25th, 1717.

Hugh Caulkin(s) and his son John removed to Norwich in 1660. David the younger son remained in New London, and inherited the homestead farm given by the town to his father at Nahantick. Edward Palmes, John Prentis, David Caulkins and William Keeny lived on adjoining farms, and for a considerable period occupied a district by themselves, around the present Rope Ferry and Millstone Point.

David Caulkins married Mary, daughter of Thomas Bliss of Norwich.

Children.

1. David, b. July 5th, 1674.	6. Mary.
2. Ann, b. Nov. 8th, 1676.	7. Joseph, bap. Nov. 3d, 1694.
3. Jonathan, b. Jan. 9th, 1678-9.	8. Lydia, " Aug. 9th, 1696.
4. Peter, b. Oct. 9th, 1681.	9. Ann, ——
5. John, ——	

Lieut. Jonathan Caulkins, second son of David, served in the frontier wars against the French. A later descendant of the same name, Capt. Jonathan Caulkins, was in the field during a considerable portion of the Revolutionary War.

Ensign George Way, died in Feb., 1716-7.

This was the period of the *Great Snow*, famous throughout New England. Ensign Way lived at the West Farms, not far from Lake's Pond, and after his decease his remains were kept for eleven or twelve days, on account of the impassable state of the roads. He was finally interred on the 7th of March, being brought into town by men on snow-shoes.

The family of Ensign Way removed from New London. He had several children, but Lyme was probably the place of their nativity. His wife was Susannah, daughter of Joseph Nest.

George and Thomas Way were brothers; their father was George Way, of Lyme, or Saybrook, and their mother the only child of John and Joanna Smith. Thomas Way appears to have lived from childhood in New London. His wife was Ann, daughter of Andrew Lester, and he had ten children ranging in birth from 1688 to 1714. About the year 1720, he removed with the younger part of his family to East Haven, where he died in 1726. His sons David and James married in East Haven; John, another son, settled in Wallingford.

Thomas Way, Jr., died in New London before the removal of the family, at the age of twenty. A small stone of rough granite was placed at the head of his grave, on which the following rudely picked characters may still be deciphered.

T. W. DIED ye 22 DEC. 170 11 (1711.)

Daniel Way, the oldest son of Thomas, born Dec. 23d, 1688, and Ebenezer, born Oct. 30th, 1693, are ancestors of the Way families of New London and Waterford, branches of which have emigrated to Vermont, New Hampshire and other states and also to Canada. Capt. Ebenezer Way, of the old fourth United States regiment, who commanded a company in the army of General Harrison at the battle of Tippecanoe, was a descendant of Ebenezer, son of Thomas.

Joshua Baker, died Dec. 27th, 1717.

He was son of Alexander Baker of Boston, and born at the latter place in 1642. He came to New London about 1670, and married Sept. 13th, 1674, Hannah, relict of Tristram Minter. They had Alexander, born Dec. 16th, 1677; Joshua, Jan. 5th, 1678-9; John,

Dec. 24th, 1681; Hannah and Sarah, twins, 1684; also a son Benjamin and daughters Mercy and Patience.

Another Baker family belongs to New London, of earlier date than that of Joshua. "William Baker of Pequot," is noticed in 1653. Thomas, by supposition his son, was a householder in 1686, living north of the town plot at Foxen's Hill. No registry of marriage, birth or death relating to this family before 1700, has been found. John Baker married Phebe Douglas, Jan. 17th, 1703-4.

Thomas Jones, died Oct. 6th, 1718.

His wife was Catharine, daughter of Thomas Gammon of Newfoundland, whom he married June 25th, 1677. He lived at first near Alewife Cove, but removed into the North Parish, and his only son Thomas became a proprietor of the town of Colchester.

Daniel Wetherell.

The following memorials collected from the town book, and from the graveyard, are more comprehensive than they would be if molded into any other form.

"Daniel Wetherell was born Nov. 29, 1630, at the Free School-house in Maidstone, Kent, Old England."

"Daniel Wetherell of New London, son of William Wetherell, Clericus of Scituate, was married August 4, 1659, to Grace, daughter of Mr. Jonathan Brewster."

Children.

1. Hannah, b. Mar. 21st, 1659-60.	3. Daniel, b. Jan. 28th, 1670-1.
2. Mary, b. Oct. 7th, 1668.	4. Samuel, bap. Oct. 19th, 1679.

"Here lyeth the body of Captⁿ Daniel Wetherell Esq. who died April ye 14th 1719 in the 89th year of his age."

Capt. Wetherell's usefulness continued almost to the day of his death. From 1680 to 1710 he was more prominent in public affairs than any other inhabitant of the town. He was town-clerk, moderator, justice, assistant, judge of probate, and judge of the county court. No man in the county stood higher in point of talent and integrity.

The two sons of Capt. Wetherell died young. His daughter Hannah married Adam Picket; Mary married first, Thomas Harris, and second, George Denison. His family, like the families of several other founders and benefactors of the town—Picket, Christophers, Palmes, Shaw, &c.—was perpetuated only in the female line.

Andrew Davis, of Groton, died April 23d, 1719.

John Davis was one of the planters of Pequot in 1651, and came probably from Ipswich. In 1662 he was master of a vessel. His death is not registered, but there is little hazard in assuming that his relict was the Widow Davis whom Major Palmes married for his second wife, and that Andrew Davis of Groton was his son. It is difficult to construct a family history out of the scanty materials afforded by early records. We gather fragments, but the thread is wanting which should bind them together. The wife of Andrew Davis was Mary, daughter of Thomas Bailey. Of his children we can obtain no information, except that it is fair to presume that Andrew Davis, Jr., was his son. The latter married Sarah Baker, Dec. 9th, 1708. A Comfort Davis, mentioned in 1719, and William Davis who died in 1725, may also be sons.

Lieut. John Richards, died Nov. 2d, 1720.

He was the oldest son of the first John Richards, and his wife was Love, daughter of Oliver Manwaring. He had a large family of ten or twelve children, of whom only four (John, George, Samuel and Lydia) survived their father. His inventory, which comprises *gold buttons*, silver plate, and gold and silver coin, shows that an advance had been made beyond the simple frugality of the first times. He owned the Bartlett farm on the river, one-half of which was prized at £315, which indicates a still greater advance in the value of lands. No spot in New London was more noted than the *corner* of Lieut. Richards (now opposite the court-house.) It was for many years the most western dwelling in that direction, with only the school-house and pasture lots beyond.

Capt. George Richards, a son of Lieut. John, was a man of large stature and great physical strength. Stories are told of his wrestling with various gigantic Indians, and always coming off conqueror from the combat. Capt. Guy Richards, for many years a noted merchant in New London, Colonel William Richards of the Revolutionary army, and Capt. Peter Richards, slain in the sack of Fort Griswold in 1781, are among the descendants of Lieut. John Richards.

Col. John Livingston, died 1720.

“The inventory of Lieut. Col. John Livingston, late of New London taken at the house of Mrs. Sarah Knight in Norwich, at the de-

sire of Mrs. Elizabeth Livingston widow of ye deceased who is appointed administratrix, March 10, 1720-1." The list of effects under this heading is slender. The principal items are 103 ounces of wrought plate at 10s. 6d. per ounce; a japanned cabinet, and a field tent. Colonel Livingston died abroad. His residence in New London has already been noticed. He speculated largely in Indian lands. In 1705 he purchased "Pawmehaug," 300 acres, of Samuel Rogers, and sold it subsequently to Charles Whiting. In 1710 he was one of the four purchasers of all Mohegan, the reservation of the Indians excepted. He had a farm on Saw-mill Brook, (now Uncasville) of 400 acres which he cultivated as a homestead. Here he had his mills and dwelling-house, the latter standing on the west side of the road to Norwich. It was here that his first wife, Mrs. Mary Livingston, the only child of Governor Fitz-John Winthrop, died, Jan. 8th, 1712-13. She was not interred till the 16th; the weather being very inclement and the snow deep, she could not be brought into town till that time.

Colonel Livingston's second wife was Elizabeth, daughter and only child of Mrs. Sarah Knight. The marriage has not been found registered. To Mrs. Knight, Livingston first mortgaged, and then sold the Mohegan farm. The title therefore accrued to Mrs. Livingston from her mother, and not her husband. She sold it to Capt. Stephen Harding of Warwick. Colonel Livingston had no children by either wife. The grave of the first—the daughter of Winthrop—is undistinguished and unknown. A table of freestone, with the following inscription, perpetuates the memory of the second.

"Inter'd vnder this stone is the body of Mdm Elizabeth Livingston; relict of Col. John Livingstone of New London who departed this life March 17th, A. D. 1735-6 in the 46th year of her age."

The following are items from the inventory of her effects:

A negro woman, Rose; man, Pompey.

Indian man, named John Nothing.

Silver plate, amounting to £234, 13s.

A damask table-cloth, 80s.

Four gold rings; one silver ring; one stoned ring.

A pair of stoned earrings; a stone drop for the neck.

A red stone for a locket; two pair of gold buttons.

A diamond ring with five diamonds, (prized at £30.)

John Edgecomb, died April 11th, 1721.

His will calls him aged. His estate was appraised at £681, and consisted of a homestead in the town plot, and two considerable farms.

“ John, son of Nicholas Edgecombe, of Plymouth, Old England, was married to Sarah, daughter of Edward Stallion, Feb. 9th, 1673.”

Children.

1. John, born November 14th, 1675; married Hannah Hempstead.
2. Sarah, born July 29th, 1678; married John Bolles.
3. Joanna, born March 3d, 1679-80; married Henry Delamore.
4. Nicholas, born January 23d, 1681-2.
5. Samuel, born 1690. *S- 44, 183, 444, 560*
6. Thomas.

Mr. John Edgecombe married for his second wife, Elizabeth, relict of Joshua Hempstead.

The name of Edgecomb is connected with the early settlement of Maine. Sir Richard Edgecomb, of Mount Edgecomb, Devonshire, had an extensive grant of land from Sir Ferdinando Gorges, in 1637, on Casco Bay and the Saco River. Nicholas Edgecomb, who is supposed to have been a near relative, was actively engaged in establishing a settlement on the bay, and himself visited it in 1658. This person was probably the father of John Edgecomb, of New London. Robert Edgecomb, another supposed son of Nicholas, settled in Saco, and left descendants there.¹

Henry Delamore married Joanna Edgecomb, Feb. 14th, 1716-17. He was a recent emigrant from the old world, and styled himself “ late master spar-maker to his majesty the king of Great Britain, at Port Mahon.” His second wife was Miriam Graves, but it does not appear that he left children by either wife. His relict, Miriam Delamore, married the second John Bolles, and this carried the Delamore homestead into the Bolles family. It was where the Thatcher house now stands, on Main Street, at the corner of Masonic Street.

Capt. Peter Manwaring, died July 29th, 1723.

He perished by shipwreck, on the south side of Montauk Point, as stated in a previous chapter. This enterprising mariner is first named a little before 1700. His relationship with Oliver Manwaring has not been ascertained, but the probability is that he was his nephew.

¹ See Folsom's Hist. of Saco and Biddeford, p. 112.

He followed the seas with great assiduity. His family consisted of a wife and three daughters.

Thomas Manwaring was probably a younger brother of Peter. He married in 1722, Esther Christophers, and is the ancestor of the Lyme branch of Manwarings.

Oliver Manwaring, died November 3d, 1723.

He was then ninety years of age, and had been an inhabitant of the town about sixty years. His house-lot of eleven acres was bought on the 3d of November, 1664. The nucleus of this homestead, consisting of the house plot and garden, has never been alienated by the family, but is still in the possession of a descendant in the direct male line from Oliver.

Oliver Manwaring married Hannah, daughter of Richard Raymond. His wife connected herself with Mr. Bradstreet's church, in 1671, at which time they had four children baptized: Hannah, Elizabeth, Prudence and Love. After this were baptized in order, Richard, July 13th, 1673; Judith, in April, 1676; Oliver, February 2d, 1678-9; Bathsheba, May 9th, 1680; Anne, June 18th, 1682; Mercy. All these children were living at the period of Mr. Manwaring's death: the eight daughters were married and had families. He bequeathed to his grandson, John Richards, (the son of his daughter Love,) all bills and bonds due to him "and particularly that bond which I had from my nephew, Oliver Manwaring, in England."

Sergeant Ebenezer Griffing, died September 2d, 1723.

His age was fifty years, and he had been about twenty-five in New London. His parentage and native place have not been ascertained. He married Mary, relict of Ebenezer Hubbell, February 9th, 1702-3. Their children were John, Samuel, Peter, Lydia and Mary. John and Samuel left descendants.

Richard Dart, died September 24th, 1724.

This was sixty years and twelve days after the date of his first purchase in New London. He was eighty-nine years of age. His oldest son, Daniel, born May 3d, 1666, married, August 4th, 1686, Elizabeth Douglas, and about the year 1716, removed to Bolton, in Hartford county. Most of his children, eleven in number, either

went with him or followed in his track. The other sons of Richard and Bethiah Dart, were Richard, born May 7th, 1667; Roger, November 22d, 1670, and Ebenezer, February 18th, 1672-3. These all became fathers of families, and their descendants are numerous.

John Arnold, died August 16th, 1725.

His gravestone says "aged about 73." His wife died November 28th, of the same year. We assume with confidence that John Arnold was a son of Joseph Arnold, of Braintree, Mass., the latter having the birth of a son John registered April 2d, 1650-1. He was a resident in Norwich, in 1681, and later; but before 1700, removed to New London, where he married, December 6th, 1703, Mercy, relic of Samuel Fosdick. They had two daughters: 1. Ruhamah, who married an Ely, of Lyme, and 2. Lucretia, who became the second wife of John Proctor, A. M.

Harwood.

George Harwood can be traced as a resident in New London only between the years 1651 and 1657, inclusive. He had a son John, whose birth probably stands recorded in Boston—John, the son of George and Jane Harwood, born July 5th, 1639.¹ The family probably resided on the outlands of the town, and therefore seldom present themselves to our view. John Harwood, a young man aged twenty-three years, and apparently the last of the family, died February 23d, 1726. He made a brief will, in which he mentions no relative, but bequeaths what little estate he has to Lydia, daughter of Israel Richards.

Thomas Bolles,² died May 26th, 1727, aged eighty-four.

Samuel Bolles, died August 10th, 1842, aged ninety-nine.

The person last mentioned was grandson to the former, and yet the time between the birth of the one, and the decease of the other, was 199 years, an immense space to be covered by three generations, and a remarkable instance for our country, where the practice of early

¹ Hist. and Gen. Reg., vol. 2, p. 189.

² At first frequently written Bowles.

marriages operates to crowd the generations closely together. The intervening link is John Bolles: Samuel was the son of his old age, born when his father had numbered sixty-seven years.

A family tradition states that Thomas Bolles came to this country with brothers, and that they arrived first upon the Kennebeck coast; but Winthrop, the founder of New London, having some knowledge of the family, invited them all to his plantation. Only Thomas answered the call, the others remaining where they first landed. It is some corroboration of this account that the name of Bolles is found among the early settlers of Wells, in Maine.

Thomas Bolles is found at New London about 1668. Of his marriage we have no account. He bought house and land at Foxen's Hill, and there lived with his wife Mary and three children: Mary, born in 1673; Joseph, in 1675,¹ and John, in August, 1677.

On the 5th or 6th of June, 1678, while Mr. Bolles was absent from home, a sudden and terrific blow bereaved him of most of his family. His wife and two oldest children were found dead, weltering in their blood, with the infant, wailing but unhurt, by the side of its mother. The author of this bloody deed proved to be a vagabond youth, who demanded shelter and lodging in the house, which the woman refused. Some angry words ensued, and the reckless lad, seizing an ax that lay at the wood pile, rushed in and took awful vengeance. He soon afterward confessed the crime, was carried to Hartford, tried by the court of assistants, October 3d, condemned and executed at Hartford, October 9th, 1678.

The records of the town do not contain the slightest allusion to this act of atrocity. Tradition, however, has faithfully preserved the history, coinciding in important facts with the account contained in documents on file among the colonial records at Hartford. John Bolles, the infant thus providentially preserved from slaughter, in a pamphlet which he published in after life, concerning his peculiar religious tenets, alludes to the tragic event of his infancy, in the following terms:

“My father lived about a mile from New London town, and my mother was at home with only three little children. I being the youngest, about ten months old, she, with the other two were murdered by a youth about sixteen years of age, who was afterward executed at Hartford, and I was found at my dead mother's breast.”

¹ In some papers at Hartford, this child is called Thomas; at his baptism the name registered was Joseph.

Tradition states that the blood of the child Mary, who was killed as she was endeavoring to escape from the door, flowed out upon the rock on which the house stood, and that the stains long remained.¹

Thomas Bolles married, 2. Rebecca, daughter of Matthew Waller, who died February 10th, 1711-2. His third wife was Hopestill, relict of Nathaniel Chappell, who survived him, and died in 1753, aged about ninety. Mr. Bolles was much employed in town affairs, and for nearly twenty years was in the commission of the peace. It does not appear that he had any children after the death of his first wife.

John Bolles married Sarah, daughter of John Edgecomb, July 3d, 1699, by whom he had eight sons and two daughters. By a second wife, Elizabeth Wood, of Groton, he had five more children: Samuel, the youngest, was born May 10th, 1744. Mr. Bolles died in 1767, aged ninety, and in his will enumerates thirteen children then living. Similar instances in our early history, where the heads of a family and six, eight or ten children all live beyond the span allotted to our race, occur with sufficient frequency to produce the impression that life to maturity was more certain, and cases of medium longevity more numerous in the first three generations after the settlement, than in the three that succeed them. Certainly such instances were of more frequent occurrence than at the present day, in proportion to the population.

Samuel Fox, died September 4th, 1727, aged seventy-seven.

Samuel and John Fox were sons of Thomas Fox, of Concord. Samuel Fox married Mary, supposed to be daughter of Andrew Lester, and born in Gloucester, in 1647, March 30th, 1675-6. They had a son Samuel, born April 24th, 1681. After this he contracted a second, third and fourth marriage, and had sons, Isaac, Samuel and Benjamin, which should probably be assigned to the second wife, Joanna, who died in 1689. The third wife was Bathsheba, relict of Richard Smith, and daughter of James Rogers, (born in Milford, 1650.) There is no record made of any marriages or births in the family after 1681. A singular caprice led Mr. Fox and some others in that day to give the same name to two children by a different

¹ This house is said to have stood a little south of the stone mansion built by Capt. Daniel Deshon, now owned by Capt. Lyman Allyn. The platform of rock, near which the house stood, has been partly blasted away.

mother. When a name, therefore, is repeated in a list of children, it is not always an indication that the first named had died before the birth of the other. Samuel Fox, in his will, makes bequests to his two sons, Samuel the elder and younger. The former had settled in the North Parish, at a place still known as Fox's Mills. He is the ancestor of the Fox families of Montville.

John Fox, son of Thomas, of Concord, married Sarah, daughter of Greenfield Larrabee, June 2d, 1678. They had a son John, born June 1st, 1680, who died December 12th, 1711, leaving a wife, Elizabeth, but no children. They had other sons and daughters, but all died without issue, except Benjamin. In a deed of 1718, he calls Benjamin, "my only child which it hath pleased God to continue in the land of the living."

John Fox married, 2. Hannah, relict of Thomas Stedman; 3. Mary, daughter of Daniel Lester, 2d. His last wife was fifty years younger than himself, and granddaughter to his sister.¹


Mrs. Sarah Knight.

A cloud of uncertainty rests upon the history of Mrs. Knight. She was born about 1665, but where, of what parentage, when married, who was her husband, and when he was taken from her by death, are points not yet ascertained. All that is known of her kindred is, that she was related to the Prout and Trowbridge families, of New Haven. The few data that have been gathered respecting her, in this vicinity, will be rehearsed in order. In 1698, she appears at Norwich, with goods to sell, and is styled widow and shopkeeper. In this connection it may be mentioned that among the planters, in a settlement then recently commenced by Major James Fitch, of Norwich, at Peagscomtuck, now Canterbury, was a John Knight, who died in 1695. It is possible that Mrs. Knight was his relict; she appears to have had one child only, a daughter Elizabeth; and it is probable that John Knight had no sons, as the continuation of his name and family has not been traced. He is not the ancestor of the Knight family afterward found at the West Farms, in Norwich, which originated with David Knight, who married Sarah Backus, in 1692, had sons and daughters, and died in 1744.

Mrs. Knight remained but a short time in Norwich, perhaps three

¹ The wife of Daniel Lester, Sen., was Hannah Fox, of Concord. This singular connection is mentioned in the *New England Weekly Journal*, printed in Boston, April 20th, 1780, after noticing the death of John Fox.

or four years. At the time of her celebrated journey from Boston to New York, in 1704, she was a resident of Boston. In 1717, she was again living at Norwich; a silver cup for the communion service was presented by her to the church, and the town by vote, August 12th, gave her liberty to "sit in the pew where she used to sit." In 1718, March 26th, Mrs. Knight and six other persons were presented in one indictment "for selling strong drink to the Indians." They were fined twenty shillings and costs. It is added to the record, "Mrs. Knight accused her maid, Ann Clark, of the fact." After this period, Mrs. Knight appears as a land purchaser in the North Parish of New London, generally as a partner with Joseph Bradford; she was also a pew-holder in the new church built in that parish, about 1724, and was sometimes styled of Norwich, and sometimes of New London. This can be easily accounted for, as she retained her dwelling-house in Norwich, but her farms, where she spent a portion of her time, were within the bounds of New London. On one of the latter, the Livingston farm, upon the Norwich road, she kept entertainment for travelers, and is called innkeeper. At this place she died, and was brought to New London for interment. A gray head-stone, of which an exact impression is given below, marks the place.



The only child of Mrs. Knight, Elizabeth, relict of Col. John Livingston, survived her and presented her inventory, which comprised two farms in Mohegan with housing and mills—£1,600, and estate in Norwich—£210. Mrs. Knight was a woman of considerable distinction in her day. She certainly possessed more than a common portion of energy, talent and education. She wrote poetry and diaries, transacted various kinds of business, speculated in Indian lands, and at different times kept a tavern, managed a shop of merchandise and cultivated a farm. Her journal kept during a journey from Boston to New York, performed on horseback and in company with the post or with chance travelers, in the year 1704, was published a few years since under the editorial supervision of Mr. Theodore Dwight. This journal in manuscript had been carefully preserved in the Christophers family, to whom it came after the death of Mrs. Livingston; Sarah, wife of Christopher Christophers, who was a Prout, of New Haven, and a relative, being appointed to administer on her estate. From a descendant of this Mrs. Christophers, viz., Mrs. Ichabod Wetmore, of Middletown, the manuscript was obtained for publication. It had been neatly copied into a small book. The original was not returned to Mrs. Wetmore and is now supposed to be lost.¹

George Geer, died in 1727.

The Isbell farm bought by George Geer Oct. 31st, 1665, was bounded north by the line between New London and Norwich, (now Ledyard and Preston.) George Geer married Sarah, daughter of Robert Allyn, Feb. 17th, 1658-9. They had six sons and as many daughters. Capt. Robert Geer was one of the leading inhabitants of North Groton during the first half of the eighteenth century, and his mill was one of the three places where all warnings were to be posted.

Fargo.

The first of this name in New London was Moses, who became a resident in 1680. He had nine children, of whom the five youngest were sons—Moses, Ralph, Robert, Thomas and Aaron. Moses

¹ These particulars were communicated by the daughter of Mrs. Wetmore, Mrs. Andrew Mather, of New London.

Fargo, or Firgo as it was then often written, and his wife Sarah, were both living in 1726.

Thomas Leach, died Nov. 24th, 1732.

He was eighty years of age and had dwelt in the town upward of fifty years. By his first wife, Abigail, daughter of Richard Haughton, he had but one child; viz., Sarah, who was born in 1684 and married in 1706 to Andrew Crocker. His second wife was Mary daughter of Clement Miner; and his third, the relict of John Crocker. His children by the three wives amounted to thirteen. The sons who lived to have families were, Thomas, born about 1690; Clement, in 1693; Samuel, in 1707; Joseph, in 1709; Richard, in 1711, and Jonathan, 1716.

John Ames, died June 1st, 1785.

He had been about forty years an inhabitant of New London, and had sons, John, Robert and Samuel. No registry of their births has been found.

CHAPTER XX.

From 1700 to 1750.—Death of Governor Winthrop.—The Minister of New London chosen Governor.—Settlement of Rev. Eliphalet Adams.—List of 1708 and 1709.—Expedition of 1711 against Canada.—Death of Governor Saltonstall.—War with Spain.—Memorials and petitions for fortification.—Petition to the King.—Expedition to Cape Breton.

WHEN post-offices and post roads were established in America, which was near the commencement of the eighteenth century, the great route from Boston to New York was through New London, which was then reckoned 110 miles from Boston and 156 from New York. By act of Parliament in 1710, New London was made the chief post-office in Connecticut; single letters from thence to New York paid ninepence; to any place sixty miles distant, fourpence; one hundred miles distant, sixpence.¹

From the *Boston News Letter*, which began to be issued in April, 1704, and was the first newspaper published in North America, the following extracts are taken.

“ New London, Aug. 9th, 1704. On Thursday last marched from hence, Capt. John Livingston with a brave company of volunteers, English and Indians to reinforce the frontiers.”

“ Boston, June 11th, 1705. Captain John Livingston, with the other messengers sent by our Governor to the Governor of Canada at Quebec to concert the exchange of prisoners, returned this day.”

“ Boston, Nov. 27th, 1707. About 4 o'clock this morning the Honorable John Winthrop, Esq., Governor of his Majesty's Colony of Connecticut, departed this life in the 69th year of his age: being born at Ipswich in New England, March 14th, anno 1638:—Whose body is to be interred here on Thursday next the 4th of December.”

The event announced in this last extract claims some further notice from the historian of New London. Governor Winthrop had

¹ See this act in Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 7, p. 71.

gone to Boston for medical aid, in an enfeebled state of health. He died in the tenth year of his office, and was interred in the same tomb with his father and grandfather, in the church-yard of King's Chapel. His public duties since the year 1690 had kept him much of the time away from New London, yet this always continued to be his home. His death was an important event to the town. As a member of the commonwealth it had lost its head, and as a community it was bereaved of a tried friend and influential citizen. It led the way also to another removal—that of their minister. On the death of the governor, a special assembly was convened to elect a temporary successor, and a majority of the votes were given for the Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall, of New London. He accepted the appointment and on the 1st of January, 1708, took the oath of office. At the annual election in May, he was chosen governor by the votes of the freemen and was annually re-elected to the office from that time until his death.

A transition so sudden from the sacred desk to the chair of the magistrate is an unusual, if not a solitary event. How the appointment was received by the church and congregation under Mr. Saltonstall's charge, we do not learn, as no entry was made on either the town or church record respecting it. But from the known popularity of Mr. Saltonstall, we may suppose that in the first instance they were filled with grief and amazement. We are told by the historian Trumbull, that the Assembly addressed a letter to his people, acquainting them that their minister was called to engage in another important course of service and using arguments to induce them to acquiesce in the result.

Mr. Saltonstall himself has been freely censured for thus resigning a spiritual incumbency to engage in the routine of temporal affairs. The Rev. Isaac Backus, the venerable Baptist author of the Church History of New England, says of him with severity: "He readily quitted the solemn charge of souls for worldly promotion." But Mr. Saltonstall doubtless acted upon his own convictions of duty and believed that he could more effectually benefit his generation in the charge which he now assumed than in that which he laid down. He had been the messenger of the town for twenty years and may even have thought that a change of ministration would not be injurious to his flock, especially as he still remained in the church and stood ready as before to assist them with his counsel.

The personal gifts of Mr. Saltonstall added much to his influence. He was tall and well proportioned, and of dignified aspect and de-

meanor. Some points of his character carried perhaps to excess, acquired for him the reputation of being severe, imperious, and of seeking self-aggrandization. But among his brethren of the clergy he enjoyed unbounded popularity. He strove to exalt the ministerial office and maintain its dignity, and was himself the exponent of rigid orthodoxy. It was perhaps clerical influence, acting invisibly, which raised him to the chief magistracy. He loved synods and councils and was for giving them large powers. A friend to law and order, he would have men submit to authority and live soberly, taking reason and religion for their guides. In his view, the affairs of both church and state should be managed by rules, judiciously established and then made firm and unalterable. The platform of ecclesiastical discipline formed at Saybrook, accepted by most of the churches, and established as the law of the state in October, 1708, was the embodiment of the principles which he favored. That instrument owed much to his counsels and influence.

Being thus an advocate for rigorous ecclesiastical authority, he was disposed to check all who dissented from the established rule, with the harsh strokes of discipline. It was during his ministry that the principles of the regular Baptists were planted in Groton. On that side of the river, within the circle of his own church, many were discontented with his ministry. A list of "Complaints against the Elder of the Church of Christ in New London," was drawn up in 1700, signed by five members of the church, viz., James Avery, John Morgan, Samuel Bill, John Fox and James Morgan, Jr., and carried before the General Court in May, who referred it to an ecclesiastical council that was to convene at Killingworth in June. Of the nature of these complaints we are not informed. The result of the council was communicated to the church in New London, June 19th; and this was followed by a vote of suspension from church privileges of the offending members. The difficulty did not end here. A paper of *remonstrances* was next drawn up and signed by several persons, who were dealt with in the same way—suspended from membership until they should acknowledge their offense and tender their submission. These persons were termed *subscribers* in a way of reproach; but most of them were afterward reconciled to the elder and restored to the church.

Mr. Saltonstall's register of baptisms commences Dec. 6th, 1691, and ends Dec. 21st, 1707. The number is about six hundred and forty. The admissions to the church during this period of sixteen years, were one hundred and fifty-four. The number of marriages

recorded by him is thirty-seven. The first is in March, 1697, and this is the earliest notice we find of the marriage rite performed by a clergyman in New London. It may be inferred from the limited number in his register, that even at this period the magistrate had more business in this line than the minister.

A town meeting was held, June 7th, 1708, to determine on the means to be employed in order to obtain "an able and faithful minister of the gospel." It will be remembered that at this time the whole town (since the separation of Groton) contained but one meeting-house, one regular church and congregation, and one ordained minister. The whole, therefore, were concerned in the vacancy of the pulpit. It was decided that Deacon William Douglass and Deacon John Plumbe should repair with all convenient speed to Boston and ask advice of the reverend ministers there, with respect to a fitting person, and "to mention to them particularly the Reverend Mr. Adams, who now preaches in Boston, and ask their thoughts concerning his being called to the work of the ministry here." Whatever person should be recommended they were to invite in the name of the town to come and preach "for some convenient term in order to a settlement, if it may be, and to wait upon him in his journey hither." Finally, it was ordered "that the selectmen furnish the deacons with money to defray the charges of their journey."

This mission was successful; the services of Mr. Eliphalet Adams, a young minister of great promise, were engaged, and on the return of the deacons with this favorable report, the town expressed entire satisfaction at the prospect before them and complimented the envoys with a gratuity in lands. In their vote they say: "Mr. Adams is well accepted by the town for the ministry, and if he shall see cause to settle, we will do what is honorable for his settlement and support."

Mr. Adams was the son of Rev. William Adams, of Dedham, Mass., by his first wife, Mary Manning. The second wife and relict of Rev. William Adams had married Major James Fitch, of Canterbury; and one of his daughters was united in marriage with the Rev. Samuel Whiting, of Windham. Eliphalet Adams having these connections in Connecticut, had spent considerable time in the colony, and his character and style of preaching were well known. No long delay, therefore, was necessary to enable the people of New London to decide on his qualifications. He arrived in town August 20th, and an invitation to settle was extended to him Sep-

tember 8th, with a request for a speedy ordination, and offering him as a settlement the hundred pounds given by the country to the town toward the settlement of a minister.

The gratuity here mentioned was bestowed by the legislature as a compensation in part for depriving the town of its former minister, Mr. Saltonstall—oil in return for light. To this sum £88 were added by subscription. The salary was fixed at £90 *per annum*, which was to be made up in three several ways—by rates, by interest of the Liveen fund, and by strangers' money: that is, contributions from visitors in the town who should attend church. It was customary for strangers of distinction to make a handsome donation on such occasions, and it was usually kept distinct from the offerings of the inhabitants; the latter being often deducted from their rates.

Mr. Adams was ordained Feb. 9th, 1708-9. Gov. Saltonstall appeared as the representative of the town to declare their acceptance of the candidate. The assisting ministers were Mr. Samuel Whiting, Mr. James Noyes and Mr. Timothy Woodbridge.

A committee was soon afterward chosen to seat the meeting-house, or rather to fill the vacancies, for it was ordered that no person should be removed, unless it was to be seated higher, and in graduating the places, the committee were instructed to consider age and service done to the town and charges borne in town affairs. Leave was given to Gov. Saltonstall to build himself a pew on the north side of the meeting-house, between the pulpit and the north-west corner pew; "his honor agreeing with the successors of the late Gov. Winthrop for removing the pew he sat in, either home to the pulpit, or home to the corner pew, to make room for building the pew aforesaid." The capacity of the meeting-house was soon afterward enlarged by building an additional gallery on each side above the first.

At this period, the pews of greatest honor were each side of the pulpit. As we pursue the line of years downward, we find *the pew* always a subject of interest. No woman of spirit and ambition regarded it as a matter of indifference in what pew she should sit in church.

"In town meeting April 30, 1723, it is voted—

"That Mrs. Green the deacon's wife be seated in y^e fore seat on the woman's side."

"Mercy Jiggels is by vote seated in the third seat on the woman's side where she is ordered by the town to sit."

"Jan. 13, 1723-4. Voted, that for the benefit of setting the psalm Mr. Foe-dick is seated in the third seat at the end next the altar."

It almost excites a smile at the present day to see so much grave legislation about the seats of individuals at church ; but birth, rank and station had certain privileges in those days which are no longer conceded, and this was one of the channels in which emulation ran. In 1728, a controversy between two families nearly related, about the possession of a pew, reached such a height, that it was brought before the town meeting, and a committee appointed to hear the matter and order one of them to desist going into the pew. It appeared that the two men, brothers-in-law, occupying the pew together, the wife of each claimed the upper seat, which was the post of honor, and neither would yield the precedence.

While inside of the church, and treating of its arrangements, a few details from the Hempstead diary may be interesting.

“July 23. (1721) A contribution to build a house for the Rector of Yale College; a very small one.”

“Aug. 5. (1722) A contribution for the support of the Presbyterian ministers to preach at Providence—per order of the Governor and Company.”

“Nov. 14. (1725) A contribution for a Canterbury woman, who had three children at a birth and all living.”

“May 19 (1731.) I paid Mr. Adams 30s. which I subscribed to give him to buy him a negro man.”

“Aug. 17. (1734) A large book of Mr. Baxter’s works is brought into the meeting house and left there to read in, between meetings for those who stay there.”

The following vote was passed at a meeting of the church, in 1726 :

“Whereas divers persons of good character and deportment stand off from joining us because a relation of experience is insisted on—it is agreed that hereafter this is not to be considered a test, but indifferent, and those who have great scruple and difficulty may be excused.”

The list of New London, returned to the General Court in October, 1708, was £8,476, 14s. Number of males, 249. Hartford, New Haven, Windsor and Norwich, stood higher in point of property, but only Hartford and Windsor in the number of men.

In Oct., 1709, the list was £10,288, 3s.; males, 188. The reduction in one year of the number of males, is sixty-one. Norwich also was reduced from 174 to 155; Hartford from 320 to 230. Connecticut raised that year a body of 350 men, under Col. Whiting, for the Canadian frontier, and it is probable that the returns were made while they were in the field. In that case, New London furnished beyond her proportion of the quota.

Expeditions against Canada formed a marked feature of the colonial history of New England. Those vain enterprises were always recurring, and consuming the strength and treasure of the country, without any compensation. The officers of the regiment raised in Connecticut, in 1709, were Col. Wm. Whiting, Major Allyn, Capt. John Clark, of Saybrook, and Capt. John Livingston, of New London; the last two both having the rank of major, but commanding foot companies. Among the enlistments from New London county, for the expedition of 1711, were fifty-four Indians, procured by Gov. Saltonstall, and commanded by Capt. Peter Mason.¹

The meetings of the governor and council were often held at New London, during the Saltonstall administration. In March, 1711, the governor was visited by some French ambassadors, but the particular object they had in view is not known.² During the whole of that year, the occasional appearance of French vessels on the coast kept the inhabitants in a state of constant apprehension. In May and June, a military watch was kept up at the mouth of the harbor for forty-six nights, under the charge of Lieut. John Richards. The expedition against Canada, of this year, was exceedingly unfortunate. Heavy were the tidings that came through the country, after the wreck of the English fleet in the St. Lawrence, Aug. 22d. That disastrous event fixed a black seal on the day. It was in this expedition that Capt. John Mayhew, of New London, an old Newfoundland trader, was employed as a pilot.

In June, 1712, the governor and council ordered a beacon to be erected on the west end of Fisher's Island, and a guard of seven men, under charge of Nathaniel Beebe, to be kept there, with a boat in readiness to convey intelligence to the main land. Privateers were hovering upon the coast, and it was apprehended that they might combine together, and seizing a favorable opportunity, slip into the harbor and surprise the town. The Fisher's Island watch was kept up for three months. New London in this war suffered considerably in her shipping, several of her merchant vessels being cut off by French privateers. Hempstead writes:

“ Aug. 5. (1712) Wm. Crocker, Captain of the Scouts, came home from

1 Council Records.

2 “ March 21, 1712. At a meeting of the Governor and Council, Ordered that the Treasurer pay to Joseph Chamberlin of Colchester the sum of one pound and thirteen shillings for his entertainment of the French Embassadors in their journey to and from New London in March 1711.”—Council Records.

Northampton ; one of his men had been killed, and two taken prisoners—all three belonging to Hartford.¹

“ Oct. 30. A suspension of arms was proclaimed at ye fort ; two guns and three chambers were fired.”

“ Aug. 26. (1713) Peace was proclaimed between England and France ; both companies in arms.”

“ Dec. 3. (1714) King George was proclaimed—the four companies were in arms.”

The existence, at this period, of four military companies, two of which had been recently formed, one in the North Parish, and the other at the West Farms, shows the advance of population. In 1683, there was but one company of train-bands in all New London, which then included Groton.

The superior court was held in New London, for the first time, in September, 1711. No court-house having then been erected, the session was held in the meeting-house. Before this period the superior court had only sat in New Haven and Hartford. It was now made a circuit court, each county to have two sessions annually. Richard Christophers was one of the assistant judges, and Capt. John Prentis, county sheriff.

“ In town meeting April 15. 1717.

“ Voted that this town do utterly oppose and protest against Robert Jacklin a negro man's buying any land in this town, or being an inhabitant within s'd town and do further desire the deputies yt shall attend the Court in May next yt they represent the same to the Gen. Assembly that they would take some prudent care that no person of yt colour may ever have any possessions or free-hold estate within this government.”

Sept. 20th, 1724, Governor Saltonstall died very suddenly of apoplexy, having been apparently in full health the preceding day. He was interred the twenty-second, with all the civic and military honors which the town could give. Col. Whiting, and Captains Latimer and Christophers, were the officers in command. “ The horse and foot marched in four files ; the drums, colors, trumpets, halbersts, and hilts of swords covered with black, and twenty cannons firing at half a minute's distance.” After the body had been laid in its resting-place, two volleys were discharged from the fort, and then the

1 “ Due Crocker's Comp”—Oct. 22, 1712.—£215, 15s. 6d.”—State Records.

military companies, first the troop, and afterward the foot, "marching in single file, as each respectively came against the tomb, discharged, and so drew up orderly into a body as before, and dismissed."¹

The remains of Governor Saltonstall were deposited in a tomb, which he had caused to be excavated in the burial-ground for himself and family, and in which his second wife, Elizabeth, and her infant child, had been previously laid. John Gardiner, son-in law of the governor, died a few months after him, (Jan. 15th, 1725,) and was the fourth inhabitant of this silent chamber. Another son-in-law, Richard Christophers, was gathered here in 1736, and Capt. Roswell Saltonstall, the oldest son of the governor that survived infancy, in 1738. Other members of the family have been laid here, from time to time.² The tablet that surmounts the tomb is adorned with the family hatchment, and the following inscription :

"Here lyeth the body of the Honourable Gurdon Saltonstall Esquire, Governor of Connecticut who died September the 20th, in the 59th year of his age, 1724."

G: Saltonstall.

Governor Saltonstall was born at Haverhill, Mass., in 1666, and graduated at Harvard, in 1684. His name, *Gurdon*, was derived from the family of his grandmother, whose name was Mariel Gurdon. He had three wives—first, Jerusha, daughter of James Richards, of Hartford, who died in Boston, July 25th, 1697; second, Elizabeth, only child of William Rosewell, of Branford, Conn., who died in New London, Sept. 12th, 1710; third, Mary, daughter of William Whittingham, and relict of William Clarke, of Boston, who survived him, and died in Boston, in 1729.³

¹ Hempstead.

² It is not remembered that this tomb has been opened but three times since the commencement of the present century—in 1811 for the reception of the remains of Winthrop Saltonstall, Esq.; in 1845, for those of an unmarried daughter of the same, Ann Dudley Saltonstall, aged seventy-five; and once to receive the body of a young child of William W. Saltonstall, formerly of New London, but now of Chicago.

³ The births of his children and the death of his second wife are registered at New London, but neither of his marriages.

Children of Gurdon Saltonstall, Esq., and Jerusha his wife.

1. Elizabeth, born May 11th, 1690; married, first, Richard Christophers; second, Isaac Ledyard.
2. Mary, born Feb. 15th, 1691-2; married Jeremiah Miller.
3. Sarah, born April 8th, 1694; married, first, John Gardiner; second, Samuel Davis; third, Thomas Davis.
4. Jerusha, born July 5th, 1695; died Sept. 12th, 1695.
5. Gurdon, born July 17th, 1696; died July 27th, 1696.

Children of Gurdon Saltonstall, Esq., and Elizabeth, his wife.

6. Rosewell, born Jan. 19th, 1701-2. Settled in Branford.
7. Katherine, born June 19th, 1704; married —— Brattle.
8. Nathaniel, born July 1st, 1707; married Lucretia Arnold, in 1733.
9. Gurdon, born Dec. 22d, 1708; married Rebecca Winthrop, in 1733.
10. Richard, born Sept. 1st, 1710; died Sept. 12th, 1710.

Capt. Rosewell Saltonstall, the oldest son of the governor that survived infancy, married a lady of Hartford, (Mary, daughter of John Haynes, and relict of Elisha Lord,) and fixed his residence in Branford, the home of his maternal ancestors; but he died in New London, while on a visit to his brother Gurdon, Oct. 1st, 1738. He had been seized with a nervous fever, the first day of his arrival, and lived but twelve days afterward. It was remarked that he seemingly came home on purpose to die, and be laid in the tomb with his parents. He was highly esteemed in New London, being a man of irreproachable Christian character, and amiable in all the relations of life. His relict married Rev. Thomas Clap, of Windham, afterward president of Yale College.

In the year 1735, the county of New London exhibited a scene of internal strife and uneasiness, which continued for several years. It was caused by a local jealousy between the rival towns of New London and Norwich, for the possession of the courts. An act of Assembly in October, 1734, decreed that the superior and county courts should henceforward be held alternately at New London and Norwich, elevating the latter place to the rank of a half-shire town. This act, the inhabitants of New London declared to be injurious to them, "and of ill example." They remonstrated, and petitioned again and again, to have it repealed, but without success. In the spring of 1739, the agents of the town were instructed to pledge the reimbursement to Norwich of what had been laid out by them in building a court-house and prison since the passage of the act, in case

it should be rescinded. The Assembly, however, refused once more to remove the courts from Norwich.

It was perhaps this controversy which made the existing authorities so unpopular in New London. At the freemen's meeting of April 8th, 1740, Hempstead observes, that the people "were furiously set to make an alteration in the public officers of the government; one hundred and forty-three voters—not above six or seven for the old governor, and generally for Mr. Elliot, Governor, and Thomas Fitch, Lieut. Governor." Talcott was however continued in office till his death, which took place Oct. 11th, 1741; and on that occasion, New London, by demonstrations of respect paid to his memory, showed that her enmity had been temporary and was then forgotten.

Intelligence was received in the autumn of 1739, that letters of marque and reprisal had been issued under the great seal of England, against Spain. The numerous depredations upon English commerce, the unlawful seizures of English subjects and their property, had provoked this measure. Affairs had been for some time rapidly tending toward an open rupture. Preparations for hostilities were made by both kingdoms, and there was every reason to suppose that war would soon be declared, and that its disastrous effects would extend to the colonial settlements in North America. No place upon the sea-board was more exposed, or less prepared for defense, than New London. The inhabitants were alarmed; they assembled in town meetings and prepared a memorial to the governor, urging him to convene the legislature without delay, and to recommend to them the immediate fortification of the town. This memorial, approved by the town on the first Monday in January, 1740, was drafted by a committee consisting of John Curtiss, Jeremiah Miller, John Richards, Thomas Prentis and Nathaniel Saltonstall. It is an interesting document, evidently emanating from full hearts, that pour forth arguments, few indeed in number, but conveyed in copious terms. The considerations which they urge are of this nature:

"That the port is an outward port, and the chief haven in the colony, liable to sudden surprisal, and the present defense utterly inefficient to protect it in such peril.

"That it is greatly for the interest of the whole colony, that it should be put into a proper state of defense, as all our vessels are obliged here to enter and clear, and there is no fort erected in any other port or haven upon all the sea-coast of this colony, nor vessel of force to guard the same, and so no safety to

them who go out, nor to them that come in, nor refuge for the pursued, but much greater danger within the harbor than without.

" That this weak and undefended condition of the town and port renders us an easy prey, and will in all reasonable construction, invite the attempts of our enemies against us, seeing or hearing concerning us that we live carelessly without walls or strongholds, or other defense under heaven, and are unworthy the care of providence, without the exercise of prudent endeavors for the safety of our lives and fortunes."

In conclusion they say :

" Forasmuch as this colony hath not as yet been much burdened, nor the public treasure exhausted with expensive fortifications and garrisons to defend their frontiers by sea and land, as the neighboring provinces have, the charges thereof can not be distressing, nor justly esteemed grievous to the inhabitants at this day; but we rather hope that as all the other provinces are not only in a proper state of defense, but are less or more provided for the offensive part, and to contend with the enemy in battle, so this colony upon like occasion will exemplify that figure and heroic dignity it hath a right to assume, as well for the honor of the government as the safety of its borders, and provide and equip a suitable vessel to guard the coasting vessels, and to be ready on other occasions, as well as erect proper fortifications to defend the town and vessels in the port."

The reply of the governor, addressed to the selectmen, was of a moderate temper, assuring them of his hearty concurrence in any future measure for their defense, but declining to convene the legislature expressly for that purpose. This letter was laid before the town January 24th, 1739-40, and acted like oil upon ignited coals. Since the draft of the petition, authentic news had arrived of the formal declaration of war, and the town in their excitement declared "that the danger of a surprisal by the sudden attack of the enemy is most imminent and certain." A second address to the governor was voted, and Messrs. Gurdon Saltonstall, Jeremiah Miller, Richard Durfey, John Curtiss and John Prentis, were detailed for a committee to wait personally upon his honor, and prefer the petition with urgency.

In consequence of this second petition, the governor convened his council at Hartford, February 7th, upon whose deliberations the committee from New London attended.

The firmness of the council was proof against importunity. They were too prudent to vote away the money of the people without giving them a chance to be consulted. Yet they yielded in some measure, and out of the funds already appropriated for the defense of the sea-coast, they ordered the battery at New London to be reconstructed, furnished with some suitable pieces of cannon, and garrisoned

by a detachment of forty men from the militia of the town, ten of whom were to be always on duty.

These measures failed to satisfy the town. Being laid before the people at a public meeting, they declared them wholly inadequate to the exigency. The question being put,

“Whether it be expedient for this town to rest in the provision that the governor and council have made for their safety; *resolved in the negative.*”

After a preamble fully stating what had been done, and their great apprehension of invasion, the record proceeds :

“In confidence that his majesty’s tender care of his subjects extends to these distant parts of his dominions and exposed plantations, and out of his royal bounty and indulgence to the infant state of this colony, will grant us effectual redress according to the necessity and urgency of the case:

“*Voted*, that his sacred majesty King George the second, our rightful sovereign, be humbly addressed in this our extremity, and that a petition proper therefore be prepared and laid before this meeting.”

A petition was accordingly prepared, but it is scarcely necessary to say that it was never wasted across the ocean. The governor and leading men of the colony used their influence to conciliate the inhabitants, and prevent the execution of the design. Several town meetings were held on the subject, which adjourned from day to day without doing any business, until February 28th, when the question was put,

“Whether the prosecution of our address to his majesty to render the port and town of New London defensible against the invasion of our enemies shall be suspended till the sessions of the General Assembly in May next; *resolved in the affirmative.*”

The inhabitants were thus quieted for a time, resting in the confident expectation that the Assembly would devise some plan of defense for a town and harbor which was in fact their frontier and outpost. In the mean time the attention of all New England was diverted toward a grand expedition fitted out by the British ministry against the Spanish dominions in the West Indies and on the northern coast of South America. Troops were raised in the colonies by voluntary enlistment, to join this expedition. They went forth with high hopes, but the issue was disastrous. Admiral Vernon, who commanded the British squadron, took Porto Bello, in November, 1739, only to make it the grave of the army. The same commander, subsequently besieged Cartagena, but his force was so reduced by a mortal sickness, which was engendered in those tropical climes and

carried off its thousands and tens of thousands, that he was obliged to abandon the siege and return to Jamaica.

No military roll or domestic record has preserved the names of those soldiers from Connecticut, who shared in the plunder of Porto Bello, or died miserably under the walls of Cartagena. But it may be conjectured that various names which disappear from the rolls about this time, were extinguished in that unfortunate enterprise, or in the expedition against Cuba, which soon followed.

War was declared against Spain in the spring of 1740. Gurdon Saltonstall, of New London, having been raised to the rank of colonel of the militia, gave a banquet on the 24th of April, to his friends ; and at this entertainment, a large number of civil and military officers, and other inhabitants being assembled, the colonel read the proclamation of the governor, that day received, declaring war to exist with Spain.¹

In July, 1740, six recruiting lieutenants came on from New York, bringing 200 stands of arms, and other equipments for volunteers. Landing first at New London, they dispersed toward Boston, Providence and Hartford, beating up for men to join the king's forces in another expedition against the Spaniards. Cuba was now to be the object of attack. A soldier's tent was forthwith erected on the training field, near the meeting-house, and an officer stationed there to enlist recruits. Many young men of the town and neighborhood were induced to join the company. They sailed in August. The fate of the expedition, as in the former case, was decided by a mortal disease, which cut off a large part of the army. In the summer of 1742, a few sick men were brought home from Jamaica; they disseminated the fatal camp epidemic through the several families to which they belonged, and these spread it yet further in the town, and thus the number of victims of the expedition was doubled.

In the spring of 1744, intelligence was received that a new power had entered into the contest. France had declared war against England, and England against France. This was just the drop which made our excitable town overflow. Little had been done in the way of fortification. Rumors of invasion thickened the air; faces were sad and hearts heavy with apprehension.

The legislature was then in session, and it was confidently expected that they would not separate without making some provision for the

¹ Hempstead. The diarist observes, "The colonel wet his new commission bountifully."

defense of New London. But in this the town was greatly disappointed; no appropriation was made for their relief. As soon as this was known, a town meeting was warned, which met the 12th of June, to consider their grievances. After ordering watch-houses to be built at the harbor's mouth, and on the fort land, (now Parade,) they appointed committees to draw up a memorial to the governor and a petition to the king, the latter to be held in reserve, and only used if the former application should be unsuccessful.

The committee immediately drafted a memorial to the governor:

“ When (say they) the Honourable General Assembly at their last session had advice that war was proclaimed in England against our most formidable enemy the king of France, it was generally concluded here, that some adequate provision for our security would have been made. But when our representatives returned, and we were informed nothing could be obtained for us, we were greatly surprised and distressed.”

They proceed to state that the harbor often had vessels riding in it to the value of eighty thousand pounds, and now that France had joined in the war, even those of greater value might be expected in; that the European and household goods were of sufficient importance to invite an enemy, and that probably the first French privateers that should appear on the coast, knowing the value of the plunder, and the weakness of the place, “ whose only defense under heaven is a battery of four guns in town, and three for alarm at the harbor's mouth,” would make an immediate descent upon them. The memorialists then give loose to their fears and fancy, and delineate the picture that would be presented when the town should be overcome “ by a French enemy;” houses in flames, substance plundered, inhabitants slaughtered. “ Alas ! (say they) it will then be too late for those that remain to fly to your honor for aid to preserve the lives and fortunes thus unhappily destroyed.” They next advert to what the king had done toward fortifying Georgia and Boston, and observe that if the colony do nothing for them, they shall think it “ a duty we owe to Almighty God, who commands us to preserve our own lives, to apply to the king for aid.” They conclude with disclaiming any disgust with the government, or any intention to bring the charter privileges into danger by this measure, which they say is purely a measure of self-defense, and inclosing a copy of the petition, intended to be presented to the king, they subscribe, in behalf of the distressed town of New London,

G. SALTONSTALL, DANIEL DENISON, } Committee.
SOLOMON COIT, THOMAS FOSDICK, }
33*

No favorable answer being obtained to this memorial, a vote passed in town meeting, 26th of June, authorizing the selectmen to take immediate measures to forward to the king the following petition:¹

"The humble representation and petition of the inhabitants of the town of New London, in the colony of Connecticut, in New England, to the king's most excellent majesty:

"May it please your majesty, we your very dutiful and obedient subjects being fully sensible that your majesty's royal ear is ever open and ready to hear, and your paternal care and goodness ever ready to diffuse itself even to your most remote subjects, beg leave with the greatest submission to represent the consequence [importance] of this harbor and town, and its defenseless state.

"Our harbor is the principal one in this colony, and perhaps the best in North America, capable to receive the whole navy of Great Britain, being at least seven miles in length, and near one mile in breadth, six fathoms water, bold shore and excellent anchor-ground; all the navigation trading to this colony enter and clear at your majesty's custom-house in this port, and we shall probably have twenty, thirty, or perhaps forty vessels at a time, laden mostly with provisions, belonging to this and the neighboring governments, waiting for convoy, and have not any thing to defend such fleet from your majesty's enemies but a battery of seven guns, (some of which are very unfit for service,) and three other guns at the harbor's mouth, about three miles distant, and have no reason to question but an enemy on our coast will soon gain intelligence, when such number of vessels shall be here, and we fear make them a quick prey. With such large quantities of provisions, they will be enabled to fit out many more privateers, to the great annoyance of other your majesty's good subjects, and what renders such attempts from an enemy more to be expected, is the easy entrance to this harbor, it being very free and bold, and in three hours' sail they may be again without land in the open sea.

"Our town has upward of 300 fighting men—and therein is your majesty's custom-house above mentioned—every inhabitant true and loyal to your majesty, but by great losses suffered at sea, by the depredations of the Spaniards, &c., are not able of ourselves to put our harbor and town in a proper posture of defense, and fear we shall fall an easy prey to an haughty, aspiring enemy unless your majesty graciously provide for our defense in this our weak state. We beg leave to throw ourselves at your majesty's feet, our most gracious king and common father to his subjects, beseeching your majesty in your royal wisdom and paternal care, to order such defense for us, as may enable us in a manner becoming Englishmen, to repel the attempts of your majesty's enemies that shall be made on us, and secure all your majesty's good subjects coming into this harbor for protection.

"We pray the mighty King of kings to preserve your sacred majesty from all the attempts of open and secret enemies—to bless and prosper your arms, and to clothe your enemies with confusion, that your majesty may be long continued to reign over us and then be received to reign in eternal glory, Amen."

¹ The committee to prepare this petition were Joseph Coit, Richard Dursey, Edward Robinson, Jonathan Prentis, Solomon Coit.

Of the fate of this petition nothing further is known ; it is never heard from again, either town-wise or otherwise. The records of the town are from this period entirely silent in regard to the war, which it may be remembered, continued four years longer and was terminated by the treaty of Aix la Chapelle in April, 1748. In the mean time the noted expedition to Cape Breton intervened, and though the records contain no allusion to it, a few facts, gleaned from other sources will be given, in order to show the connection of the town with that great adventure of New England enterprise.

The General Assembly, by a vote of Feb. 7th, 1744-5, ordered 500 men to be immediately raised in Connecticut by voluntary enlistment, to join the forces of the other New England colonies in the expedition against Cape Breton. The premium offered was large, viz. ten pounds in old tenor bills, one month's wages paid before embarking, and an exemption from all impressments for two years. The sloop Defence was to be equipped and manned and to sail as a convoy with the transports. The land forces were ordered to New London to embark, and to return to New London to disband. Roger Wolcott was appointed commander-in-chief; Andrew Burr, colonel; Simon Lothrop, lieut. colonel; Israel Newton, major.

The men were divided into eight companies, under the following captains :

David Wooster,	Robert Denison,
Stephen Lee,	Andrew Ward,
Daniel Chapman,	James Church,
William Whiting,	Henry King.

Of these captains, Lee, Chapman and Denison were from New London, as were also John Colfax and Nathaniel Green, lieutenants. Capt. John Prentis commanded the Defence. Col. Saltonstall was one of the committee to superintend the concern—Jeremiah Miller was the commissary of the forces. Alexander Wolcott, resident at New London, went out as surgeon's mate.

The troops began to gather at New London the last week in March. The tents were pitched in a field north-west of the town plot, which has ever since been known as the Soldier lot. It is between the Norwich and old Colchester roads.

April 1st, Gen. Wolcott arrived and was welcomed with salutes from the fort and the sloop Defence. His tent was pitched on the hill at the south-east corner of the burial place. On Sunday the 7th Mr. Adams preached to the general and soldiers, drawn up on the meeting-house green. On the 9th the commissions were published

with imposing ceremonies. The eight companies were arranged in close order on the green; and the throng of spectators covered the hill. Through them, Gen. Wolcott, supported right and left by Col. Andrew Burr and Lieut. Col. Simon Lothrop, marched bareheaded from his tent to the door of the court-house, where the commissions were read.¹ The troops embarked Saturday, April 18th, and the next day at 1 o'clock, P. M., the fleet sailed. It consisted of the colonial sloops of Connecticut and Rhode Island, four other sloops; two brigs and one schooner. The Defence carried Gen. Wolcott and 100 men.

Two months of anxious suspense to the country, and eager thirsting for news, succeeded. The 24th of April was kept through New England as a public fast for the success of the enterprise. On the 19th of June the mournful tidings arrived that our forces had been defeated in an attempt upon the Island Battery with a loss of 170 men. Major Newton of Colchester and Israel Dodge of the North Parish, were among those who had fallen victims to disease. Soon afterward, Lieut. Nathaniel Green of New London, came home sick. New recruits were demanded. In this vicinity 200 men were speedily raised and marched into town, from whence they were taken by transports sent round from Boston, which sailed for the seat of war, July 6th. The next day, a special post from Boston, came shouting through the town—

Louisburg is taken!

On the 18th of July, the Middletown transport, Capt. Doane, arrived in the harbor with General Wolcott and eighty soldiers, mostly sick. The 25th of the same month, was the day of public thanksgiving for our success.

Capt. Prentis in the colony sloop returned the latter part of October. Of his crew of 100 men, not one had fallen by the sword, but a fourth part had died of disease. November 4th, two transports left the port with 150 recruits for Cape Breton. The next spring, the remains of the army began to return. On the 27th of June Capt. Fitch came home with a considerable party, and on the 2d of July a schooner brought in the last of the Connecticut troops, with the exception of a few that had enlisted for three years.

Thus ends as connected with our port, this brilliant, but unprofitable expedition. Capt. Prentis in the sloop Defence, had made a part of the naval force, and was with the fleet in actual service at the

time that the rich prizes were taken. In April, 1746, he accompanied Mr. James Bowdoin, of Boston, to England, to urge the claim of the provincial seamen to a share of the prize-money, which was withheld by Admiral Warren. The admiralty allowed the claim, and placed the British and provincial vessels on the same footing. But Capt. Prentis while awaiting the decision of the court, made an excursion into Cornwall, to visit the Edgecombs of Mount Edgecomb, being invited thither to partake of the Christmas festivities. While absent on this tour, he took the small-pox; of which disease he died, after his return to London, in January, 1746-7.

Scarcely were the wearied troops from Louisburg disbanded before a flourish of drums and trumpets sounded through the country, demanding enlistments to go against Canada. On the 30th of June, 1746, a general muster of the five military companies of New London was called, in order to obtain volunteers for a new army, which like that of the previous year had its rendezvous at New London. The forces gathered in August, 700 in number, and encamped on Winthrop's Neck, about twenty days. The officers vied with each other in their tents, but that of Capt. Henry King of Norwich was acknowledged to exceed the others in the neatness and order of its arrangements. On the 12th of September, they broke up and embarked for the scene of action.

On the 24th of September, 1746, news arrived in town by express from Boston "that a French fleet of *twenty-six men of war, and 15,000 land soldiers in transports*, were seen off Cape Sables on the 10th instant."¹

This article is only given as an instance of the uncertainty and exaggeration of rumor. The fleet seen was the celebrated armament under the Duke D'Anville, supposed to have been fitted out to recover Louisburg and Annapolis, to destroy Boston, and devastate the New England coast. It consisted of eleven ships of the line, thirty war vessels carrying from ten to thirty guns, and transports with 3,100, regular troops.²

Active exertions were made in all the colonies to defend the most important and exposed positions on the coast, and the troops raised were prepared to concentrate their forces wherever an invasion should be attempted. In Connecticut one-half of the whole militia was detached and ordered to be in readiness to march in case of an invasion. The issue is well known. A series of remarkable calamities

1 Hempstead.

2 Trumbull's Conn., vol. 2, p. 286.

assailed the French fleet. Storm, shipwreck, failure of expected recruits and supplies, pestilential disease, divided councils, disconcerted plans, the sudden death of successive commanders, and a final destructive blow from a furious tempest, all concurred so opportunely in the discomfiture of the French fleet, that they seemed like visible agents employed by Providence, to avert the danger from New England. Dr. Holmes in his Annals observes that the country was saved as in ancient times, when "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera."

[*Note concerning Capt. Prentis.* As it is a part of the business of the historian to preserve all popular superstitions and traditions that illustrate the customs and opinions of the age, we must here notice a story that probably grew out of the prolonged absence of Capt. Prentis in England, and the anxiety of his friends concerning him. It was afterward currently reported, that the very day he died in London, a man on horseback, mounted on just such a horse as Prentis used to ride, came galloping into New London, before sunrise, and at each end of the town stopped at a house, and with loud knocks upon the door, gave notice "Capt. Prentis is dead!" He then disappeared, his transit having been so rapid that no one was able to discern his countenance, or identify his person.

Capt. Prentis left six children under nine years of age; five of them were daughters. Previous to his voyage to England, he had bought up the claims of his crew to their share of the prize-money. This money was allowed by the admiralty, and transmitted to Boston, but from some delay, the causes of which are not now understood, it was not paid over to the heirs of Prentis for many years; not indeed until after the marriage of all his daughters. It was finally obtained through the exertions of Richard Law, Esq., who had married one of the daughters. Business matters were not then so generally settled by attorneyship and proxy as at present, and on the occasion of the payment of these arrears the family train, consisting of the younger John Prentis and his five sisters, with their respective husbands, all went to Boston together, to receive their dues. The females had never before been so far away from home, and almost every incident was to them a novel adventure. Two days were occupied in going, and the same in returning; the intermediate night being spent at a tavern in Plainfield. Each of the men was a character of peculiar stamp. Among them were a lawyer, a mechanic, a merchant, a farmer and two sea-captains, one of them of Irish birth. Capt. William Coit was particularly original in his manner. He was blunt, jovial, eccentric; very large in frame; fierce and military in his bearing, and noted for always wearing a scarlet cloak. The populace of New London called him *the great red dragon*. We can readily imagine that this journey would be full of strange scenes and occurrences. Could it be faithfully described no fanciful embellishments would be necessary to render it a rare descriptive sketch.]

1 The author may be allowed to name an esteemed friend, the late Captain Richard Law, as the source from whence this and other vivid pictures of past scenes, are derived.

CHAPTER XXI.

Schools.—Ferries.—Mills.—Wolves.—Great Snow of 1717 —The Moving Rock.—Amusements.—Memoranda.

HAVING brought the general history of the town to the year 1750, we may now return and gather up the fragments that have been dropped by the way, or set aside, in order to be arranged as topics.

Schools. For the first fifty years after the settlement, very little is on record in respect to schools; and from the numerous instances of persons in the second generation who could not write their names, it is evident that education was at a low ebb. Female instruction, in particular, must have been greatly neglected, when the daughters of men who occupied important offices in the town and church, were obliged to make a mark for their signature. Yet the business of teaching was then principally performed by women. The school-ma'am is older than the school-master. Every quarter of the town had its mistress, who taught children *to behave*; to ply the needle through all the mysteries of hemming, over-hand, stitching and darning, up to the sampler; and to read from A, B, C, through the spelling-book to the Psalter. Children were taught to be *mannerly*, and pay respect to their elders, especially to dignitaries. In the street, they stood aside when they met any respectable person or stranger, and saluted them with a bow or courtesy, stopping modestly till they had passed. This was called *making their manners*. In some places in the interior of New England, this pleasing and reverent custom still maintains its ground. A traveler finds himself in one of these virgin districts, and as he approaches a low school-house by the way-side, he is warned by eye and ear, that he has fallen upon forenoon play-tide. The children are engaged in boisterous games. Suddenly every sound ceases; the ranks are drawn up on each side of the road in single file; the little girls fold their hands before them

with a prim courtesy, and the heads of the boys are uncovered with a grotesque swing of the hat, or buff-cap. Who is not inly delighted with this primitive salutation? It is like finding a clear spring of water gushing out of a rock by the way-side.

Peculiar reverence was paid to the minister. Bold was the urchin who dared to laugh within his hearing. That reverend personage was accustomed to catechise them once a month in the meeting-house, and to accompany the exercise with many a stern reproof, or grave admonition.

In the year 1673, Robert Bartlet, a lonely man living near Gabriel Harris, on Close Cove, died; and by a nuncupative will, made in presence of some of the selectmen and other respectable persons, bequeathed his estate to the town, to be improved for the education of children. The records of the county court attest that this will was accepted and recorded at the June session, and administration granted to the five gentlemen specified therein; viz., Rev. Simon Bradstreet, Edward Palmes, Daniel Wetherell, Charles Hill and Joshua Raymond. It may be presumed that Bartlet had no children, no relatives, no intimate friends with him, or near him, and that he acted by the advice of those around him, to wit, the minister and the magistrates.

The oldest books of wills belonging to the county, were destroyed in the burning of the town by the British, in 1781; and neither the original will of Bartlet, nor any copy of it, has been found. But it is ascertained from various legislative acts and town votes, that the main purpose expressed, was the support of a school, where the poor of the town might be instructed. No other specification is mentioned, except a request that Gabriel Harris might be requited for the kindness shown him in his sickness. To this the administrators faithfully attended, and by deed of Dec. 19th, 1674, conveyed to Harris two acres of land at Mamacock, as a compensation for his care of Bartlet.

Three Robert Bartlets are found among the early emigrants to New England, between whom no connection has been ascertained: one arrived in 1623,¹ in the vessel called the *Anne*, (which came next after the *Mayflower* and *Fortune*,) and is known to have continued in or near Plymouth, where he left posterity.² A second of

¹ Davis' New England Memorial.

² Savage, (Ms.)

the name is found among the first settlers of Hartford, and is mentioned by Trumbull as suffering a severe penalty in 1646, for an infringement of the old Connecticut code. This person removed to Northampton in 1655, and there died in 1676, leaving several children.¹ The third of the name is our Robert Bartlet, of New London, who was the brother of William Bartlet, one of the earliest settlers of the place, whose property he inherited about 1658. Very little more is known of him. He appears to have lived with his brother's widow, and to have taken care of her till her death. In a deposition of Feb., 1664-5, his age is stated to be sixty-nine or thereabouts, which would make him seventy-eight at death.

The estate which Bartlet bequeathed to the town, consisted of his homestead on Close Cove, a farm of two hundred and fifty acres on the river, north of the town, various divisions of out-lands, and the rights of an original proprietor in the commons. Nothing was done with it for many years.

In 1678, the law of the Assembly requiring that every town of thirty families should maintain a school to teach children to read and write, was copied into the town book, and a committee of five men chosen, "to consider of some effectual means to procure a school-master." This is the first town action respecting a writing-school; and from this period it may be presumed that one was kept during a part of each year, but perhaps for not more than three months.

The first Bartlet committee was appointed in 1698—Thomas Bolles, Samuel Fosdick and Richard Christophers, who were directed to look after the estate, and see that it was faithfully improved according to the will of the donor.

" Dec. 14, 1698.

" Voated that the Towne Grants one halfe peny in mony upon the List of Estate to be raised for the use of a free Schoole that shall teach Children to Reade Write and Cypher and ye Lattin Tongue, which School shall be kept two-thirds of the yeare on the West side and one third part of the yeare on the East side of the river. By Reading is intended such Children as are in theire psalters."

In May, 1701, the vote was reiterated that a grammar-school should be established; the selectmen to agree with a teacher; to employ the stipend allowed by the country, (40s. per £1,000,) and the revenue of the Bartlet estate—the latter for the benefit of the

¹Judd, of Northampton, (MS.)

poor—and parents and masters to make up what more should be necessary.

Here, then, at the beginning of the century, we may date the establishment of the first regular grammar and Latin school of the town. The first masters whose names have been recovered, were Denison in 1708, Burnham, 1710, and John Gardiner, of the Isle of Wight, (Gardiner's Island,) in 1712.

In 1713, application was made to the General Assembly for permission to dispose of the Bartlet lands; this was granted. By a special act of May 14th, the Assembly vested the title of those lands in certain feoffees, to wit, "Richard Christophers, Jonathan Prentis, John Plumbe, John Richards, and James Rogers, Jun., and their heirs forever, for the use of a public Latin School in the town of New London."

We can not but observe, that this appropriation of the legacy specially to a Latin school, appears to be swerving from the will of the donor, which was understood to regard principally the instruction of the poor in the common branches of learning.

This committee made sale of most of the Bartlet donation; five parcels of land on the Great Neck, some lots at Nahantick and Nai-wayonk, and the farm on the river; the latter was purchased by John Richards, for £300. This measure was a present benefit, but gained at the expense of a greater future good. Every year was enhancing the value of the lands, and had they been retained a century, using only the yearly rent, they would have been ample endowment for an academy.

The same year, (1713,) a school-house was built, twenty feet by sixteen, and seven feet between joints—expense defrayed by a town rate. This building, the first school-house in town of which we have any account, stood on what is now the south-west corner of Hempstead and Broad Streets. This spot was then the north-east corner of an ecclesiastical reservation; the street running west had not been opened beyond this point, and the school-house stood at the head of it. When the lot was sold in 1738, the deed expressly mentions that it took in the site of the old school-house. To this school it is understood that girls were not admitted promiscuously with boys; but attended by themselves on certain days of the week, an hour at a time, at the close of the boys' school, for the purpose of learning to write.

"Oct. 1, 1716. Voted that Mr. Jeremiah Miller is well accepted and approved as our School-master."

Mr. Miller graduated at Yale College in 1709. He was engaged as principal of the grammar-school in New London, in 1714, and continued in that situation for twelve or fifteen years. After this we find the following masters mentioned before 1750:

Mr. Cole, in 1733.	Jeremiah Chapman, 1738.
Allan Mullins, 1734.	Thaddeus Betts, 1740.
Nicholas Hallam, 1735.	Jonathan Copp, 1747.

The designation, "Bartlet School," was not used until a very recent period. During the whole of the eighteenth century, it had no name but "New London Grammar School."

"In town meeting March 5, 1721-2.

"Whereas the town by the settlement thereof doth in great part consist of farmers which, many of them are not able to go through the charges of keeping their children to school in the town plot:—And whereas the school in the town plot hath been a very considerable charge, being a Grammar school, so that the town hath not been so well able to maintain two schools:—but whereas now Providence hath so ordered that we have got our 600 acres of school land settled, which was given by the country to the grammar school, which is sold with the interest of that money and the interest of the money left by Mr. Bartlett to our school, which sd Bartlett did desire that the estate left by him might be improved for the help of the learning of children that their parents was not well able to learn them, and this town considering the great necessity of education to children, both for the advantage of their future state and towards their comfortable subsistence in the world, and being satisfied that if the school land were sold, we may set up a school or schools among our farmers, doth appoint the deputies of the town to make application in the name and behalf of the town to the General Assembly in May next, that they would be pleased to grant this town liberty to appoint trustees of the school, who may have power to sell the land, and let the money upon interest for the use aforesaid."

This application to the Legislature failed of success. A school was nevertheless commenced in the North Parish, and a rate appropriated for its support. It produced, however, great strife and contention; the inhabitants of the town plot set their faces like flint against paying taxes for the support of schools among the farmers. The town was reduced to a dilemma, and repeated their petition to the Assembly for liberty to sell the school land. They expressed an earnest desire that the children of the town should be taught "reading and other learning, and to know their duty toward God and man," for the furtherance of which ends they had "settled another school in the remote part of the town, which goeth on with good success," but which, they say, can not be kept up and the peace of the town preserved, unless the land is sold. This petition was granted. The

600 acres had been laid out in the North Parish, on the borders of Lyme. It was purchased by Mrs. Mercy Raymond and Mr. John Merritt. The school money received from the fund now established, was in 1725, £120. The town decided that one-half should be reserved for the grammar-school, in the town plot, and the remainder divided among the quarter, or circulating schools, established in different districts.

It was at this period that the people of the North Parish, aided by their proportion of the fund, established a grammar-school in their district. Mr. Allan Mullins was engaged as the principal for eight years, "to teach reading, writing, grammar and arithmetic." His salary was £25 *per annum*, with a gift of ten acres of land in fee, forever. At the expiration of his engagement in 1734, he took the grammar-school in the town plot, which paid a salary of £20 per quarter.

The committee chosen to organize a regular system of schools for the town, took unwearyed pains to arrange them in a just and equal manner, that not a single family should be left out of the calculation, and all parties might be conciliated. They were not able to accomplish their designs. In 1726, the quarters were in a state of great excitement. The special cause of disturbance does not appear; but in the main it was a struggle on the part of the farming districts to obtain an equal participation in the Bartlet and other school moneys.

A town meeting was summoned June 27th, by Capt. Rogers, the first townsman, but his colleagues not concurring in it, the measure was illegal. Hempstead observes: "The farmers universally were there, in order to gain a vote to their mind about the schools, but lost their labor."

The annual town meeting for the choice of officers was held December 26th, and the diarist records, "The farmers came in roundly, and the town mustered as well to match them, and a great strife and hot words, but no legal choice." The only entry concerning the meeting, on the town book, was this:

"Capt. James Rogers chosen first townsman; this meeting adjourned till tomorrow at twelve o'clock."

Capt. Rogers was the farmers' candidate; he then owned and occupied what was afterward known as the Tabor farm, on the Great Neck. The adjourned meeting, December 27th, opened under threatening auspices; each party turned out in greater numbers than before; 150 voters were present. The record says:

"Whereas yesterday there was a misunderstanding in the choice of the first townsmen, Capt. Rogers being then chose and entered, he for the peace and health of the town relinquishes that choice.

"Capt. Christophers chosen first townsmen.

"Capt. Joshua Hempstead, second.

"Capt. James Rogers, third," &c.

Mr. Hempstead writes in his diary on the evening after the above stormy session:

"I went with Mr. Douglas to see Capt. Rogers, who sent for us to ask our forgiveness in any thing that he had spoken that might offend us; we forgave him and he forgave us."

Happy mode of terminating an angry controversy!

The two committees for the Bartlet fund and the common school fund, were for a time distinct. In 1733, all the original Bartlet feoffees were dead, and the Assembly having designated their heirs as successors, Mr. Plumbe, the heir of the last survivor, refused to deliver up the papers to the town. This difficulty was referred to the legislature, who united the two funds, and gave the charge to a new committee, who like the former were to hold the office during life, but all vacancies were to be filled by the town.

This arrangement seemed to work well, and was continued for many years; but in later times the Bartlet or grammar-school committee, like that for the common school, has been annually appointed. The fund in modern days has never yielded a sufficient sum for the maintenance of the school. Time has diminished instead of increasing the amount.

Ferries.

In town meeting February 26th, 1701-2.

"Voted with full consent that ye ferry over the Great River which was formerly leased to Mr. Cary Latham deceased, his heires and assigns, with the ferry lott and house belonging thereunto, shall after the expiration of the aforesaid lease, wch will be the 25th of March, in the year 1705, for ever belong to a grammar school, wch shall be kept in this town, and the rents thereof be yearly payd to the master of sd school, in part of his yearly sallary. Provided nevertheless, that the inhabitants of this town, on Lord's days, thanksgiving days, days of humiliation and town meeting days, shall be ferriage free, that is, such as shall cross the ferry to attend publique worship or town meetings on such days."

The above judicious enactment has never been molested; the rent of the ferry still belongs to the public grammar-school of the town.

Brook," in the year 1712. This also is a romantic spot; the current flows into a quiet, shaded basin, which is used for a baptismal font, by the religious society located in its neighborhood.

The first fulling-mill was established by Peter Hackley, in 1693, on Nahantick River, "below the highway, where the fresh stream falls into the salt water." About the same period, John Prentis erected a saw-mill at Nahantick.

The saw-mills of Governor Winthrop have been heretofore noticed. In 1691, Fitz-John Winthrop established one near Long Cove, on the east side of the river. In 1713, the town granted to "Lt. Col. John Livingston, of N. L., what right they have to Saw-mill Brook, to erect a saw-mill and fulling-mill thereon." Major Wait Winthrop sent in a protest, which the town declared to be null and void, and refused to have it recorded. The same year Samuel Waller and his son Samuel, were allowed to erect a saw-mill on the stream which runs from Lake's Pond to Nahantick River.

In 1719, half an acre of land on Town Hill, was set apart for the erection of a wind-mill. This was just west of the Harris house. In 1726, Capt. James Rogers erected a wind-mill on this spot.

In 1721, Joseph Smith obtained liberty to erect fulling and grist-mills at Upper Alewife Cove. From him and his family this locality obtained the appellation of Smith's Cove. George Richards, the same year, erected a saw-mill on Alewife Brook. These were the earliest mill-seats of the town.

Wolves.

"Memorandum: that upon Monday the 16th day of January, 1709-10, being a very cold day, upon the report of a kennel of wolves, mortal enemies to our sheep and all our other creatures, was lodged and lay in ambuscade in the Cedar Swamp, waiting there for an opportunity to devour the harmless sheep; upon information whereof, about thirty of our valiant men, well disciplined in arms and spetial conduct, assembled themselves and with great courage beset and surrounded the enemies in the said swamp, and shot down three of the brutish enemies, and brought their heads through the town in great triumph."

"The same day a Wolfe in sheepe's cloathing designed to throw an innocent man into the frozen water, where he might have perished, but was timely prevented, and the person at that time delivered frome that danger."¹

As the subject of wolves is thus again introduced, we may observe that at this period and for thirty years afterward, a wolf-hunt was a

¹ New London records, book 4, inserted on a blank leaf of the index, by D. Weth-erell, clerk.

customary autumnal sport. From ten to forty persons usually engaged in it, who surrounded and beat up some swamp in the neighborhood. Mill-pond Swamp and Cedar Swamp were frequently scoured for wolves, in November or the latter part of October. George, son of John Richards, had a bounty of £11 for wolves killed during the year 1717. These were probably insnared. The bounty had been raised to twenty shillings per head. The bounty for killing a wild-cat was three shillings.

It was not till 1714 that any enactment was made to encourage the killing of foxes. At that time a bounty was offered of three shillings for a grown fox; with whelps, four shillings; a whelp, one shilling.

The Great Snow of February, 1716-17, is famous in the annals of New England. It commenced snowing with wind north-east, on the twentieth of February, and continued all night: the snow was knee-deep in the morning. There was no cessation of the storm during the day and a part of the next night; the wind all the time blowing furiously, and the drifts in some places ten and twelve feet high. Friday, 22d, was a fair day, with the wind north-west, blowing hard and the weather very cold. A few people, here and there, began to break through the drifts and visit their neighbors. The 23d was more moderate. On Sunday, 24th, was another fall of snow; very windy and cold, wind north-east. No meeting. Many horses and cattle found dead. After this, the weather was, for three days, fair and moderate. On the 29th, was another snow of several hours' duration, and on the 2d of March, rain and snow.¹

On Sunday, March 3d, Mr. Adams resumed the service at the meeting-house, and preached a sermon from that passage of Nahum, which says, "*The Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet.*" The audience is characterized, in the diary of Mr. Hempstead, as "a thin appearance." The sermon, however, was sent forth to preach more extensively, being printed by Mr. Green, with the title,

"A Discourse Occasioned by the late Distressing Storm Which began Feb. 20, 1716, 17. As it was deliver'd March 3d, 1716-7. By Eliphalet Adams, A. M., Pastor of the Church in New London."

At the time of the great snow, the adjourned county court was sit-

¹ These notices of the weather from day to day, are from Hempstead's journal.

ting in New London, and was for several days interrupted by the storm. The session was held in the Plumb house, (State Street.)

The Moving Rock. In the *New England Weekly Journal*, printed at Boston, (August 31st, 1736,) an account is given of a wonderful moving rock, at New London. As this phenomenon excited considerable notice at the time, it demands our attention, though probably the force of the tide is sufficient to account for the wonderful part of the story.

"A Rock ten feet long and six through, judged to weigh 20,000 pounds, had lain many years at the water's edge at New London: it is lately removed, (how, no one knows,) about twenty-five feet on rising ground; and water fills the hole where the rock used to be."

The rock here mentioned was not in the town plot, but three or four miles distant, at Poquyogh, or Jordan Cove. It was supposed to have been removed in the spring, as when first observed, the rock-weed upon it was green, but soon dried up. It had evidently been forced up a ledge, the attrition of the stone marking its course, and was lodged on the platform above. In September of the same year, it was found to have been moved four and a half feet farther on the land, and its position changed. In May, 1737, it was found a little farther removed. The fame of the Moving Rock of Poquyogh was considerably extended, and numbers of curious persons went to see it. Some attributed the phenomenon to thunder, others to an earthquake, or to an uncommon tide, or to an agency wholly supernatural, according to each one's fancy or judgment.

Amusements. The choice of military officers was always accompanied with a feast, or treat, given to the company by the successful candidate. Thus—Edward Hallam, chosen clerk of the company, (1715,) distributed cakes and gave them a barrel of cider to drink. A captain, chosen to office, might perhaps give a bushel of cakes and a gallon of rum. An appointment to a civil office was often celebrated by a festival. Daniel Hubbard, appointed sheriff of the county, opened his house for the reception of guests, at an evening entertainment, July 28th, 1735.

On training days, shooting at a mark was a customary sport. The prizes were usually given by some of the wealthier citizens, and were generally of small value, from five to twenty shillings. A silk hand-

kerchief was a *common* prize; a pair of shoe-buckles an *uncommon* one. Sometimes a sum of money was clubbed by the company, to be won. Shooting at a mark was also one of the customary Thanksgiving sports. But the prize in this case was generally a goose or a turkey.

The Thanksgiving festival was kept very much in the same way as in other parts of New England. Its predominant feature was feasting, and without the adjuncts of the roast-turkey and pumpkin-pie, would scarcely have been recognized as genuine. The supply of these articles at New London, appears to have been always equal to the emergency; at least there is no account on record of an omission or delay of the festival, through any deficiency of the stores. Colchester, one of the younger sisters of New London, has been less fortunate. In the year 1705, that town, assuming a discretionary power, which they doubtless thought the extremity of the case justified, voted to put off Thanksgiving, which had been appointed for the first Thursday in November, till the second Thursday of the month, because, says the record, "our present circumstances are such that it cannot with convenience be attended on that day."¹ The *inconveniency*, according to tradition, was a deficiency of molasses, so indispensably necessary to perfect the flavor of the pumpkin. The town meeting which passed the vote, was held Oct. 29th, and before the second Thursday of November, there was a reasonable expectation that a supply could be obtained.

Horse-races were not common, but sometimes took place. Here follows a notice of one:

"30 March 1725. A horse-racing to-day at Champlin's, (near Rope Ferry.) Five horses ran at once. Each paid down 40 shillings and he that outrun received the £20 from Major Buor. One *Bly* carried off the money."²

Raisings were seasons of feasting and festivity. A dinner or supper usually followed. At the raising of Mr. Curtiss' house, Aug. 13th, 1734, twenty-five were invited to a supper at the tavern: they were all *Reformadoes*, *i. e.*, belonging to a club of that name.

In the following extract, there is an allusion to the raising of the steeple of the old Episcopal church, that stood on the Parade:

"1735. Sept. 3.—Last night about one or two o'clock the new Snow built by John Coit Jr. for Benjamin and Isaac Ledyard, Capt. Broadhurst of Great Britain Commander, burthen about 120 tons, ready to sail, took fire, no man

being on board and burnt down to her bottom, and consumed all the masts or rigging and sails, and loading except some small matters in the bottom and heavy timber, and drove ashore on Douglas Beach. It is supposed to be wilfully done, the Captain having sent the men on shore in the day time to help raising the top of the steeple of the Church. They were all scattered abroad, some in one place, and some in another. They suspect the Captain to be guilty and have put him to prison."¹

A few notices of weddings, public rejoicings and shows, may be allowed as illustrative of the manners and customs of the period :

April 17th, 1729. A lion was brought to town in a wagon drawn by four oxen. It came by way of Lyme and Saybrook, and had been all winter traveling through the western towns. The preceding autumn it had visited Long Island, New York, the Jerseys and Albany. It was several days in New London, and was lodged in Madam Winthrop's stable, (Bank Street.)

April 13th, 1732. A great entertainment was made at Madam Winthrop's, on occasion of the marriage of Samuel Browne, of Salem, and Katherine Winthrop, which took place a fortnight previous, but was that day first made public. Mr. Hempstead says, "I was invited, and presented with a pair of gloves." Matthew Stewart, of New London, was married at Narragansett, Oct. 19th, 1735, to the daughter of William Gardiner. On his return home with his bride, he gave an entertainment, which surpassed in sumptuousness any thing before exhibited in the place.

July 2d, 1736, the inhabitants manifested their joy at the marriage of the Prince of Wales with a Protestant princess, by a public celebration of more than common note. The military officers, with some soldiers and music, were out on the occasion. Hempstead's account says :

" We had a barrel of powder out of our town stock by order of the select men, and fired seven cannon and chambers, three rounds at the fort, and three volleys of small arms, and marched up to the Town House and drank the Prince and Princesses healths. Old Mr. Gard'ner being in town gave us a £5 bill to be drunk out there and then we went to George Richards' and supped and drank wine till ten o'clock upon Club."

" March 1, 1737-8. Last night a great number of Sky Rockets were fired off from the roof of Dursey's house [in Bradley Street.] in honor to Queen Caroline's birth, and the sad news of her death is come this day by the post from New York." Hempstead.

¹ Hempstead. From probate papers on file, we learn that this English captain was suffered to break prison and decamp: his books, bed and clothes were sold at an outcry, to discharge his debts.

The following account of an excursion for pleasure, is sketched from minutes in Hempstead's diary, 1739. On the third of October, Madam Winthrop, wife of John Winthrop, who was then in England, her son John, and daughter Ann, Col. Saltonstall and wife and two children, Col. Browne, of Salem, with his wife and child, and Mr. Joshua Hempstead, went on a visit to Fisher's Island, which was then leased to George Mumford. The whole party crossed with Mr. Mumford in his sail-boat, and remained four days on the island, nobly entertained by the Mumford family. The first day was diversified with an excursion to the east end of the island; the second day a fierce storm confined them to the house; on the third, they had a morning drive to the west end, and a visit to the woods; in the afternoon a famous deer hunt. Saltonstall brought down a doe, and Mumford two bucks, one of which was immediately dispatched by a carrier to Mr. Wanton, of Newport, as a present from the party. On the 7th of October they started for home at nine in the morning, but got becalmed; the flood failed them, and they ran into Mystic. Landing near the house of Mr. Burrows, all walked from thence to John Walthorpe's, where they obtained horses, and reached home in the evening.

Memoranda in Chronological Order.

In May, 1724, Richard Rogers of New London, stated to the General Assembly, that he had eight looms in operation for making *duck* or *canvas*, and had expended £140. Again, in October, 1725, he stated that he had expended £250. The court granted him the sole right of making *duck* or *canvas* in the colony for ten years.

April 24th, 1733. This was the day of election, or of freemen's meeting. Thirty new freemen were admitted, and one hundred and forty voters present. This was considered a *great* assembly.

July 21st, 1733. The commissioners appointed by Boston and Rhode Island to settle the line east of Pawtucket River, met at the court-house in New London, viz., Col. Hicks of Hempstead, Col. Morris of Westchester, and Mr. Jackson of Jamaica, in the colony of New York; Roger Wolcott and James Wadsworth, Esqrs., and Mr. Joseph Fowler of this colony, with divers gentlemen of Boston and Rhode Island to assist.

Sept. 10th, 1734. Ten negro slaves taken to prison for being out unseasonably in a frolic at old Wright's: three that went without leave were whipped; seven that had leave, were dismissed on payment of their part of the fine, 5s. 3d. each.

Nov. 28th, 1784. A white man and Indian fined for killing deer at Fisher's Island.

In 1735, Solomon Coit of New London, in a petition to the General Court, stated that he was the only person in the colony who had works for distilling molasses.

" March 3, (1736-7,) News of the death of Capt. John Mason of New London is come in a letter from Mr. Winthrop by Capt. Walker, who wrote on the 25th of Dec^t, that he died the last Sunday, in Lumbert St. of the Small Pox. Young Mahomet died there also of small pox last summer." (Hempstead.)

Capt. Mason, mentioned above, had resided long among the Mohegans, and had been at various times their school-master, agent, overseer and guardian. After the death of Cesar, in 1723, the tribe was divided in regard to the sachemdom. One party, supported by the colonial government, was in favor of Ben-Uncas, the uncle of Cesar; the other, encouraged by Mason, declared Mahomet, a grandson of Owaneco, the rightful heir. Ben-Uncas having prevailed, Mason took the younger sachem to England, to obtain the recognition of his rights, where they both died.

" April 30.—A sad riot in town; a great deal of fighting between the grand-jurymen, Shackmaple, Dursey, Keith and others." (Hempstead.)

Jan. 3, 1788. This day was sold in New London, the township of western lands which had been assigned to this county. It was divided into fifty lots, which were sold off at prices varying from £132 to £157.

May 3d, 1738. Katherine Garrett, commonly called Indian Kate, was executed on Town Hill, for the murder of her infant child. The deed had been committed at Saybrook, about six months previous, but she had been brought to New London for confinement and trial, and the execution was ordered to be here also. The sermon of Mr. Adams, on the occasion, was published. Katherine was a Pequot of the North Stonington reservation, twenty-seven years of age; she had been brought up at Saybrook, and well instructed. This is supposed to have been the first execution in New London.

Capt. Nathaniel Coit was a noted ship-master of New London employed for a number of years in the Irish trade. The following account of the loss of his vessel, near Cork, is from an English newspaper.

Jan. 5th, 1740. "The Dolphin of New England, Nathaniel Coit master, from Cork, is wrecked on a great rock called the Roane Cariggs on the Bay of

Bantry, about four leagues from town. The vessel was staved to pieces, and a passenger drowned, but the Capt. and crew, who were six in number, got upon the rock. The bad weather continuing, no body would venture to save them, but nine brothers, sons of Morten Sullivan of Beerhoven, who after obtaining their father's leave and blessing, boldly ventured forth and brought the Captain and sailors ashore."

One of the seasons noted in the annals of New England for intense cold was the winter of 1740-41. The extreme severity of the weather at New London commenced with a violent snow-storm at Christmas. By the 7th of January, the river was frozen over between Groton and Winthrop's Neck; and the intense cold continued without interruption from that time to the middle of March. The ice extended into the Sound toward Long Island as far as could be seen from the town; Fisher's Island was united to the main land by a solid bed. On the 14th of February a tent was erected midway in the river between New London and Groton, where an entertainment was provided. A beaten path crossed daily by hundreds of people extended from the Fort (now Ferry wharf) to Groton, which was considered safe for any burden till after the 12th of March, at which time the river was open to the ferry, but fast above. People continued to cross on the ice at Winthrop's Neck till the 24th, when the river began to break up. Ice in large blocks remained in various places almost to midsummer. At one spot in Lyme parties assembled to drink punch made of ice that lay among the ledges, as late as July 10th.

July 31st, 1742. A severe thunder-storm in which a son of Jonathan Lester of Groton, ten years of age, was struck and killed. He was near his father's house at work upon hay, and had two brothers with him, one of whom was slightly wounded, the other untouched.

July 2d, 1743. A succession of thunder-showers. Two lads on horseback near the town on the Norwich road were killed, and the horse also on which they rode. They were buried the next day in one grave. They were each thirteen years of age, and sisters' children: grandchildren of Nathaniel Beeby, Senior. The house of Samuel Chapman (on the Cohanzie road) was struck by the same bolt and much shivered.

Oct. 22d, 1747. Hempstead writes—

"News came by the post of the death of my good friend, John Winthrop Esq. of this town, in London G. B. where he hath been ever since 1726. He sailed from hence in July, twenty-one years since; was aged about sixty-six."

The John Winthrop here mentioned was the son of Wait-Still

Winthrop,¹ and born in New London Aug. 6th, 1681. His death is said by other authorities to have taken place at Sydenham in Kent, Aug. 1st, 1747.

This gentleman had succeeded to most of the estate both of his father and his uncle; for Fitz-John and Wait-Still Winthrop had never divided the landed estate which they inherited from their father. The former having but one child, Mrs. Livingston, and she destitute of heirs, it seems to have been understood between the brothers, that the landed possessions should descend undiminished to John, the son of Wait. This also was the tenor of a general deed executed by Governor Winthrop in 1700, and produced after his death. A considerable amount of testimony was also brought forward to corroborate this instrument. Among other depositions on record at New London, is that of Joseph Dudley, Esq., the father-in-law of the younger John Winthrop, who testified,

"I have near forty years had a particular intimacy and friendship with the Hon. John Winthrop, Esq., late Governor of Connecticut Colony and have often heard him declare that he would keep his father's estate inviolate and unbroken for the heirs of the family and the name of his father;—and in the summer of 1707 when the present John Winthrop Esq. offered an intermarriage with my daughter, the said late Governor treated with me of that marriage of his nephew; he told me he was the best heir in the Provinces; and that all he had, as well as all that his father had, was for him," &c.

The deed however could not be proved; for it had never been recorded; Samuel Mason before whom it was acknowledged, had deceased, and the witnesses (Wm. Thompson and Jeremiah Hooper) could not be identified. Mr. Winthrop had an only sister, married to Thomas Lechmere, Esq., of Boston, who claimed an equal portion of the estate. A lawsuit between the parties ensued. The case was carried from court to court in Connecticut, and decided in favor of Lechmere. Winthrop appealed to the king in council, and in July, 1726, went to England to sustain his cause in person.

He was favorably received, and succeeded in his case. A decree of the king in council, in 1728, set aside the decision of the colonial court, and declared John Winthrop the sole heir of all the landed estate of his father and uncle, grounding this decision on the English law of primogeniture. This decree was regarded in Connecticut as a public calamity, inasmuch as it involved the abrogation of the colonial law respecting intestate estates, (which was declared

¹ Trumbull erroneously calls him (vol. 2, ch. 4) son of the last Governor Winthrop; he was his nephew.

null and void) and established the law of England giving all real estate to the oldest son. Had this decision been actually enforced we can scarcely conceive of any single act that would have caused a greater amount of perplexity, suffering and despair to the inhabitants of the colony. Families would have been broken up, and estates thrown into a mass of confusion. Happily the wise exertions of the friends and agents of the colony averted the blow. A subsequent decision was obtained confirming Winthrop in his possessions, but allowing the law of inheritance in the colony to remain as before.

Mr. Winthrop never returned to America. He was disaffected with the colonial government, and the course he had taken rendered him unpopular at home, which may account for his long residence of twenty-one years in England. His family continued at New London and in 1741, his oldest son, John Still Winthrop, went out to him and remained with him till his death.

"Nov. 25th, 1748. In the evening I went up to Col. Saltonstall's to see John Winthrop who this night arrived with Mrs. Hide from London, by the way of Nantucket first and Rhode Island next, and Fisher's Island last. Great joy to his mother and friends. He has been gone seven years next February." (Hempstead.)

CHAPTER XXII.

Groton made a town.—Account of Sir John Davie, its first town-clerk.—Packer's visit to the baronet.—First three ministers of the church, Woodbridge, Owen and Kirtland.—North society formed.—Preaching of Seabury, Punderson, Croswell and Johnson.—Baptist churches.

THE inhabitants on the east side of the river, began to ask for a separate organization about the year 1700. They supposed themselves able to stand alone and take rank among the group of towns that were gathering in the colony.

There is no evidence to show that the parting of New London from her friend and associate was otherwise than amicable. Daughter she could scarcely be called, being of nearly equal age, but she had been fostered like a sister and was now at her own request to be released from watch and ward, and left to her own management.

The terms on which the inhabitants of the west side consented that those on the east side of the river should be a town of themselves, were arranged and voted, Feb. 20th, 1704—5, and were, in substance, as follows :

“ That they pay their proportion of the town's debts; that the ferry and the land and house belonging to it, shall continue to belong to the free school on the west side; that all estate hitherto given to the ministry, or for the support of schools shall remain the property of the west side; that the inhabitants of the west side shall retain their right to cut masts or timber in the pine swamp near the straits on the east side, and the said swamp forever remain common to both sides; that inhabitants on either side, owning property on the other side shall each retain their right as proprietors.”

The same year the Assembly passed an act incorporating the town by the name of *Groton*. It is probable that this designation had long been in familiar use; it was intended to commemorate Groton in Suffolk where the Winthrops originated, and was probably first

given by Winthrop, or his sons, to the large family possessions on Poquonock Creek and Bay.

The separation was almost a split through the center in point of dimensions. The part cut off contained upward of seventy-two square miles: the greatest length from Groton Long Point to Poquonock is fourteen miles; the breadth from six to seven and a half miles. It was then an expanse of farms, forests and waste land, with nothing like a hamlet or point of centralization in the whole area, but it is now pleasantly sprinkled with villages and neighborhoods.

The first town meeting held in Groton was in December, 1705. Samuel Avery was chosen moderator and first townsman, and was annually re-chosen, until near the period of his death in 1723. The other townsmen were Samuel Fish, Nehemiah Smith, Capt. James Morgan and George Geer. John Davie, clerk; Jonathan Starr, constable.

John Barnard was chosen school-master.¹

John Davie, the first town-clerk in Groton, continued in office till December, 1707, when Nehemiah Smith was chosen to succeed him. The handwriting of Davie was peculiarly bold and distinct. He had graduated at Harvard College in 1681, and appears from the offices to which he was chosen to have been a man of activity and intelligence. He established himself in 1693 on a farm at Poquonock—the same that had been first broken up and cultivated by William Meades. We find him a rate-collector in 1695; the next year a townsmen or selectman; constable for the east side in 1702, and recorder of the new town of Groton in 1705.

A deed of sale is recorded in New London, which is in substance as follows: "Sarah Davie, relict widow of Humphrey Davie sometime of Boston in New England and late of Hartford in New England aforesaid, Esq., deceased—for and in consideration of sixty pounds current money of New England paid by John Davie of New London in New England aforesaid, yeoman, son of the said Humphrey Davie, deceased," relinquishes to him all right and title to a certain piece of land in Boston, containing two acres and a half—"in the present tenure and occupation of Mr. James Allyne minister in Boston aforesaid." July 3d, 1699.

This is conclusive testimony that John Davie of Groton, was son of Humphrey Davie, who died in Hartford, Feb. 18th, 1688-9.

¹ "Mistress Barnard is to be paid twenty shillings per annum for sweeping the meeting house and keeping the key." Groton Records.

Humphrey was brother of Sir John Davie of England, who was created a baronet Sept. 9th, 1641. To this baronetcy, and the estate attached to it, John Davie of Groton, farmer and town-clerk, succeeded in 1707. On receiving intelligence of his good fortune, he settled his affairs in haste, leased out his farm, and went to England to take possession of his inheritance.¹ The last time his name is mentioned on the Groton book previous to his departure, is in the record of a gift of £6 to be laid out in plate, for the communion service of Mr. Woodbridge's church. He never revisited this country; but subsequently sold his farm and other lands, with his cattle, stock, and proprietary rights, to John Gardiner of the Isle of Wight, (Gardiner's Island.) The deed was given by "Sir John Davie of Creedy, County of Devon, within the kingdom of England, Baronet:"—Aug. 21st, 1722.²

"The children of John Davie" are recorded in Groton, (first book,) in his own hand, as follows:

"Mary, born June 30th, 1693. John, born July 27th, 1700.
 Sarah, " Oct. 21st, 1695. Humphrey, " April 12th, 1702.
 Elizabeth, " March 17th, 1697-8. William, " March 22d, 1705-6.
 " These were all born in the town now called Groton."

The above-named children, with the exception of the youngest, are on the record of baptisms by Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall, who enters them as children of "Mr. John *Davids*," and under date of May 26th, 1695, notes: "Brother *Davids* Indian Jane made a profession of y^e Christian faith, and taking hold of the Covenant was baptized." This mistake in the name was then common. The title *brother* is not here used to designate merely church relationship: Mr. Saltonstall and Mr. Davie had married sisters—daughters of James Richards, of Hartford—which was, doubtless, in the first place the moving cause of Davie's settlement and residence in Groton.

According to tradition, the unconscious baronet was hoeing corn

¹ Douglas observes (Summary, vol. 2, p. 184) that a donation of books was made to the library of Yale College "by Sir John Davie of Groton upon his recovery of the family honors and estate in England." The word *recovery* seems to intimate that his title was contested.

² The consideration, £500, Sir John Davie empowered his attorney, Gurdon Saltonstall, to pay over in the following manner; to wit, to Mrs. Margaret Franklin of Boston, £250; to Mr. Daniel Taylor, minister of the gospel at Newark, Mrs. Mary Pratt, and Mrs. Mather of Saybrook, each £88, 6s. 8d. These were probably his nearest relatives in America, and to them he relinquished his estate on this side of the ocean.

on his farm when informed of his accession to fortune. James Packer, one of his neighbors, was at work with him, and they were at strife to see which would do the most work in the least time. Letters had been sent from England to look up the heir of the Davie estate and application being made to Mr. Saltonstall, he immediately dispatched a messenger to Groton with the tidings. This messenger arriving at the house, was directed to the field; and as he approached Davie, who was at work barefoot, with shirt-sleeves and trowsers rolled up, he inquired his name; and on receiving an answer, struck him upon the shoulder and raising his hat exclaimed, "I salute you Sir John Davie."

James Packer had made several voyages, and when Sir John Davie left Groton he gave him a hearty invitation, if he should ever find himself in England, to come to his estate in Devonshire and make him a visit, assuring him that it would always give him pleasure to see an old neighbor and hear from his American home. A few years later, Packer being in England, took the stage-coach from London and went out to Sir John's estate. He arrived just as the family were sitting down to dinner, with a party of the neighboring gentry for guests. Sir John recognized his former comrade at once; received him with open cordiality; introduced him to the company as an American friend; and treated him with marked attention. The next day he carried him over all his grounds and showed him his various accommodations. Before parting, Sir John and his lady had a long and free conversation with their visitor, in the course of which the baronet expressed himself thus:

"You see how I live, Packer: I have an abundance of this world's goods, and can gratify myself with a continual succession of pleasures, but after all I am not so happy as I was when you and I changed work at threshing and we had but one dish for dinner, and that was *corn-beans*."

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "John Davie", with a decorative flourish underneath.

The ecclesiastical independence of Groton was antecedent to its political organization. The first arrangement for their accommodation on the Sabbath, was in 1687, when it was ordered that for the

future they should have liberty to invite the minister of the town to preach on their side of the river every third Sabbath during the four most inclement months of the year. In 1702, the town consented that they should organize a church and have a minister of their own, granting him a salary of £70 *per annum* and authorizing them to build a meeting-house thirty-five feet square. The whole was to be accomplished and maintained at the joint expense of the east and west sides.

Mr. Ephraim Woodbridge was ordained their first minister, Nov. 8th, 1704. Of his ministry little is known, no church or society records of that period being extant. He was a son of the Rev. John Woodbridge, of Killingworth and Wethersfield, and grandson of Rev. John Woodbridge, an ejected minister from Wiltshire, England, who died at Newbury, Mass., in 1695, aged eighty-two. Soon after his settlement he married Hannah, daughter of James Morgan, who was of equal age with himself: both were born in 1680. He died Dec. 1st, 1725. Dr. Dudley Woodbridge,¹ of Stonington, and Paul Woodbridge, of South Kingston, R. I., were his sons.

We might here strike off the history of Groton, since technically considered it is no longer a part of the history of New London; but one who has lingered long in the vicinity of that granite township and become interested in its various associations, will not be willing to part suddenly from so dear a friend. Let this serve as an apology for keeping hold of the historical thread of the older Groton churches, and for introducing occasionally some matters that belong rather to Groton than to New London.

The second minister of the first church of Groton, was Rev. John Owen. He graduated at Harvard College in 1723,² and was ordained at Groton Nov. 22d, 1727.³ His first wife was Anna Morgan, whom he married Nov. 25th, 1730. His second wife was Mary, relict of Rev. James Hillhouse, of the North Parish of New London.⁴

1 The name of Dudley in the Woodbridge family was derived from the wife of Rev. John Woodbridge of Wiltshire, who was a daughter of Gov. Thomas Dudley, of Massachusetts.

2 Farmer.

3 Trumbull.

4 She survived Mr. Owen and married Rev. Mr. Dorrance, of Voluntown. Tradition says that the three husbands were all natives of Ireland. In the case of Mr. Owen this is doubtful; though he might be of Irish extraction.

Mr. Owen was distinguished for liberality of opinion toward those who differed from him in points of doctrine; advocating religious toleration to an extent that often exposed him to the suspicions of his brethren and the rebukes of magistrates.¹ A gravestone in the ancient burial-ground at Pequonuck, informs the passer-by that "The Reverend and pious Mr. John Owen, the Second ordained minister in Groton, died Lord's day morning, June 14, 1753, in ye 55th year of his age—

God's faithful Seer."

The only son of Mr. Owen was for many years town-clerk and teacher of the grammar-school of New London.

Third minister, Rev. Daniel Kirtland;² installed Dec. 17th, 1755; dismissed 1758.

Groton being a large town, with great inequality of surface, which rendered it very inconvenient for Sabbath-day assemblage in any one point, as soon as the advance of population would allow, the northern part, by permission of the legislature, withdrew and organized a second ecclesiastical society. The first recorded meeting of this society was held at the house of Capt. John Morgan, Jan. 3d, 1725-6. The first preacher to this society was Mr. Samuel Seabury, then a young man just assuming the sacred office. He was not ordained or settled, and remained with them only ten weeks; having preached four Sabbaths at Capt. John Morgan's, four at William Morgan's, and two at Ralph Stoddard's. At the expiration of this term or soon afterward, he declared himself a convert to the doctrines of the Church of England and crossed the ocean to obtain Episcopal ordination. He returned to this country commissioned as a resident missionary to the Episcopal church in New London. Mr. Seabury was a native of Groton, born July 8th, 1706.

In November, 1726, a survey was made of the parish of North Groton, in order to discover the exact center, which the inhabitants had determined should be the site of their meeting-house. The central point was found to be "forty or fifty rods from the south-west corner of Capt. John Morgan's great pasture," on land belonging to Samuel Newton, from whom it was obtained by exchange for the society *training field*. Until the house should be finished the preach-

¹ Trumbull, Backus, Great Awakening, &c.

² Erroneously called *Samuel* by Trumbull. There are some slight errors in Trumbull's dates respecting Groton ministers.

ing places designated were the houses of Capt. John Morgan, William Morgan, Robert Allyn and Ensign William Williams. The warning posts of the society where notices were to be set up, were at Capt. Morgan's, Ralph Stoddard's and Sergt. Robert Geer's mill. Several preachers succeeded Mr. Seabury; each engaged but for a limited time. No minister was settled until 1729.

"In society meeting, Aug. 28th, 1729.

"Voted to call Mr. Ebenezer Punderson to be our gospel-preaching minister and to offer him a settlement of £400 to be paid in two years, and a standing salary of £100."

"At a session of the General Assembly in New Haven, Oct. 9th, 1729.

"This Assembly grants leave to the inhabitants of the north society in the town of Groton to embody into church estate, they first obtaining the consent of their neighboring churches."

Mr. Punderson was ordained Dec. 29th, 1729. Mr. Adams of New London preached the sermon. The meeting-house, though not entirely completed, was comfortably fitted for the ceremony.

On the first day of January, 1733-4, Mr. Punderson made a communication to the society, avowing himself "a conformist to the Episcopal church of England," and expressing doubts of the validity of his ordination. This notice was received in the first place with amazement and sorrow, and a committee was appointed to reason with him and endeavor to convince him that his ordination was canonical and his position safe and desirable. Of course this measure was unavailing. A council was convened at the house of Capt. Morgan Feb. 5th, and the connection dissolved.

The society after this event was two years without any regular preaching. The Rev. Andrew Croswell, their next minister, was ordained Oct. 14th, 1736. The settlement offered him was £200 *per annum* for the first two years and £110 *per annum* afterward. The previous unhappy experience of the society induced them to add the following condition.

"In case he should withdraw from the established religion of this government to any other persuasion, he shall return £200 to the society."

Rev. Andrew Croswell was ordained Oct. 14th, 1736. He was a man of ardent temperament and, like Mr. Owen, deeply interested in the Great Awakening. The revival of religion in 1740 and 1741, designated by that term, swept through no part of New England with a current more powerful than in New London county. Lyme, New London, Groton and Stonington were in a state of fervid excitement. Mr. Croswell came out in writing as the champion of

Whitefield and of Davenport. He went forth, also, to interest other parishes than his own in the new way of presenting truth. In February and March, 1742, he was preaching in different towns in Massachusetts, with good success, but with "*irregular zeal*."¹

In 1746, Mr. Croswell decided on leaving Groton. Having made known his determination, a society meeting was called, which passed the following vote :

" Aug 21st, 1746. Whereas Mr. Croswell is determined to leave this society, he thinking himself called of God so to do, which thing we don't approve of, yet we shall not oppose him therein, but leave him to his own choice."

Under this Mr. Croswell entered his resignation.

" Groton, Aug. 21st. Whereas I the subscriber once took the charge of the society in North Groton, and they having left it to my choice to go away if I saw fit and thought myself called so to do, I now resign my pastoral office over them, wishing them the best of heavenly blessings and that the Most High God, if he pleases, would give them a pastor according to their own heart.

"ANDREW CROSWELL."

This was the whole form of dismission. Mr. Croswell went to Boston, and in April, 1748, the society voted that he was dismissed. Mr. Croswell became the first pastor of the Eleventh Congregational Church in Boston, which worshiped in what had been the French Protestant church in School Street. He was installed Oct. 5th, 1748, and continued in this charge till his death, April 12th, 1785, aged seventy-six.

Mr. Jacob Johnson, the third minister of this society, was ordained in June, 1749, and remained with them twenty-three years. In October, 1772, at a society meeting, he asked for a dismission, and the result is recorded in two words, "Voted, dismissed."²

Other societies than the Congregational had gained precedence in the parish. A church of Separates had been formed, which kept together a few years under Elder Park Allyn. Some Episcopalians and some Rogerenes were within their limits. In 1770, thirty-five families in that society had been released from the ministerial rates on account of attending worship elsewhere. The Congregational society kept together a short time after the dismission of Mr. John-

1 See *Great Awakening*, by Joseph Tracy.

Commissary Gorden, of South Carolina, wrote and published six letters against Whitefield in 1740. Mr. Croswell wrote an answer "in his usual biting style"—p. 55. He wrote also a Reply to the Declaration of the Associated Pastors of Boston and Charlestown, dated at Groton, July 16th, 1742—*ibid.*

2 Society Record.

son, and then gradually dwindled away and became extinct. When reorganized under the ministry of the Rev. Mr. Tuttle, in 1810, not a single member of the old church remained, nor could any record of former members be found.

Groton Baptist Church. The early history of this church is indissolubly connected with the name of Wightman. According to tradition, five brothers of the name, all Baptists, settled in Rhode Island, and were reported to be descendants of Edward Wightman, one of the last who suffered death for conscience' sake in England, having been burnt for heresy at Litchfield, in 1612. Valentine Wightman, a son of one of the brothers, removed to Groton, in 1705,¹ on the invitation of a few families who were favorably inclined toward the Baptist principles, and after exercising his gifts for a few years, gathered a church and was ordained in 1710.

Elder Valentine Wightman died June 9th, 1747. Daniel Fisk, of Rhode Island, was his successor for about seven years. Timothy Wightman, the son of the founder, was then ordained pastor of the church, May 20th, 1756, and continued in charge forty-two years. He died November 14th, 1796, in the seventy-eighth year of his age, leaving a church of 215 members. Mrs. Mary Wightman, his venerable consort, died February 19th, 1817, aged ninety-two years.²

John Gano Wightman, the son of Timothy, succeeded his father in office, and the length of his ministry almost equaled that of his parent. He was ordained in 1800, and died July 13th, 1841, aged seventy-four. Ministers sprang from the elder Wightman like branches from a fruitful vine. Many of his descendants, both in the male and female lines, have borne the pastoral office.

The Wightman church stood upon one of the wood-land ridges between Center Groton and Head of Mystic. A burial-ground lay by its side, where the two last elders, with their wives, repose. It is probable, also, that the founder of the church rests here also, but no tablet is enriched with his name.

A few years since this society built a new meeting-house, near the village, at the Head of Mystic, and thither the church has been transferred. The ancient edifice has been refitted, and is now used for town purposes.

¹ Benedict's History of the Baptists.

² Gravestone in the burial-ground near the old Wightman church.

A second Baptist church was formed in Groton, in 1765, with Elder Silas Burrows for its pastor. This church held to the principle of mixed communion till 1797, when the practice was relinquished. The meeting-house was built on Indian Hill, not far from the spot where stood the royal fortress and village of Sassaacus, in 1637: not the one stormed by Mason, but that in which the chief and the flower of his forces slept that fatal night, unconscious of the danger of their friends. The religious service and the church members have been transferred to other sections of the town, and the house itself has been recently demolished.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Early Indian deeds.—First white settler in Mohegan.—Names and signatures of the Indian sachems.—Years of strife and difficulty in the North Parish.—Church formed.—Meeting-house built.—Ministries of Hillhouse and Jewett.

THE early history of the North Parish of New London, runs through a maze of perplexity and contention. Some of the finest farms in that district flew from one possessor to another, like balls in the hands of players. Here were the Mohegans, with all their native and seigniorial rights; the Masons, guardians chosen by the Indians, with all their claims; various settlers upon the land with bounds vague and indefinite; Indian deeds of tracts, not only with bounds undefined, but some of them almost boundless, and legislative grants bitterly contested. No where in this region had speculation so wide a scope. Anarchy was for a while the consequence; but it is consoling to look back and see how the tempest passed away, and left the aspect of society clear and serene.

The Indian lands were inclosed by the settlements of New London and Norwich. After Philip's War, when the English inhabitants began to consider themselves secure and flourishing, many a longing eye was cast toward the tempting prize that lay upon their borders. The avarice of the white and the improvidence of the red man, converged to the same point, and a multiplicity of Indian grants was the result. Some were gifts of friendship, or in requital of favors double the value of the lands; some were obtained by fair and honest trade; others were openly fraudulent, or the perquisites of administering to the vicious thirst of the Indian, and degrading him below his native barbarism. Nearly all of them were, however, indorsed by the Masons, the Fitches, or the legislature, and therefore stood, according to colonial acts, on legal ground. In point of actual market value, the Indians were generally, not only paid, but overpaid, lavishly paid, for their lands.

Those who are acquainted with the tribe, will be slow to believe that they were too shy or modest in their demands. *An Indian gift*

is, in this neighborhood, a proverb, indicating a present made to secure a return of double or treble value.

The first grants of land within the Mohegan reservation, north of New London, were made by Uncas, in August, 1658, to Richard Haughton and James Rogers, and consisted of valuable farms on the river, at places called Massapeag and Pamechaug. These had been the favorite grounds of Uncas and his chiefs, but at this period he had been broken up by the Narragansetts, and was dwelling at Niantic. The deed of Norwich was signed June 6th, 1659, and the settlement of that place commencing immediately and affording him protection, Uncas returned to his former abode, and set up his principal wigwam at Pamechaug, near the Rogers grant.

The first actual settler on the Indian land was Samuel Rogers, the oldest son of James. The period of his removal can not be definitely ascertained, but probably it was soon after 1670. He had long been on intimate terms with Uncas, who importuned him to settle in his neighborhood, and bestowed on him a valuable farm upon Saw-mill Brook; promising in case of any emergency, he would hasten with all his warriors to his assistance. On this tract Rogers built his house of hewn plank, surrounded it with a wall, and mounted a big gun in front. When prepared for the experiment, he fired a signal of alarm, which had been concerted with his tawny friend, in case either should be disturbed by an enemy; and in half an hour's time grim bands of warriors were seen on the hills, and soon came rushing down with the sachem at their head, to the rescue of their friend. Rogers had prepared a feast for their entertainment, but it is probable that they relished the trick nearly as much as the banquet. It was one of their own jests: they were always delighted with contrivance and stratagem.

Rogers became a large landholder in Mohegan. He had deeds of land not only from Uncas, but his sons Owaneco and Josiah, in recompense for services rendered to them and their tribe. Gifts of land were also bestowed by these sachems on his son Jonathan, and his daughter Sarah, the wife of James Harris.

Joshua Raymond was perhaps the second person who built on the Indian lands. He was one of three persons who in 1668 advanced the £15 which the town was to pay Uncas, and received compensation in Indian land. He was also one of the committee that laid out the road between Norwich and New London, leading through the Indian reservation, and for this service received a farm on the route, which became the nucleus of a tract of 1,000 acres, lying together,

that was owned by his descendants. Mr. Raymond died in 1676, and it is supposed that the dwelling-house was built and the farm improved by him before his death ; for his son, Joshua Raymond, 2d, styles it "my father's homestead farm in the Mohegan fields." The house stood in a commanding position on the west side of the road to Norwich, eight miles from New London, and remained in possession of the family 175 years.¹

The latest signature of the sachem Uncas is found under date of June, 1683. A deed to Samuel Chester was signed June 13th, and a grant of several thousand acres in Colchester, or the south part of Hebron, to the Stebbins brothers, was acknowledged before Samuel Mason, about the same period. In June, 1684, Owaneco, in a deed to James Fitch, styles himself son of Uncas, *deceased*. This is the nearest approximation obtained to the death of Uncas. He is supposed to have been very aged, and there are traditions that during the latter years of his life, he was generally found sitting by the door of his wigwam *asleep*, and that it was not easy to rouse his mind to activity. The sachem was undoubtedly buried at Norwich, in a select position on the banks of the Yantic, which is supposed to have been the place of his father's sepulture,² and which has ever since been exclusively devoted to the descendants of Uncas. In this cemetery an obelisk of granite was erected by female gifts in 1842, which has for its inscription a single name,

UNCAS.

What is the occult meaning of this word Unkus, Onkos, Wonkas, Onkace ? Was it the original name of the sachem, or the *new name*, descriptive of some trait of character or exploit, which according to Indian usage was given him on arriving at the dignity of a chief ? The latter opinion may be assumed with some probability. In the deed of 1640, to the governor and magistrates of Connecticut, his name appears with an alias, "Uncas, alias Poquiem." The latter may have been his domestic or youthful name, the former that of the chief. Wonkas has a resemblance to Wonx, the Mohegan word for fox, an animal to whose character that of the sachem was so closely allied, that it might naturally suggest the transfer of the name. Judging from the sound, we might likewise suppose that the term Wonnux, used by the Indians for *Englishmen* or *white men*, was de-

¹ Bought of George Raymond, about 1848, by Capt. James Fitch, who took down the ancient house, and erected a new one on the same commanding site.

² The *Indian graves* are mentioned in the earliest grant of the land.

rived from *Wanax*, the fox. But in regard to the signification of Indian words, it is easy to be led astray by analogy. We can seldom prove any thing and are obliged to rest in conjecture. It is not even known, except from inference and probability, that the craft and guile of the fox had been observed by the Mohegans.

For the name of Owaneco, the son and successor of Uncas, as brave a sachem, but more pliant and amiable, we must find a less reproachful derivation. The word *wuneco* is one of the numerous variations of a term which signifies *handsome*, or fair and good, and if we prefix the *o* which was used before *w* to represent that peculiar enunciation of the letter by the Indians which is called *the whistled w*, we shall have the exact name of the son of Uncas, Owaneco or W'necko.¹

The signature of Uncas, after he had become habituated to the practice of making a mark for his name, was generally a rude representation of the upper part of the human form, the head, arms and chest, with a mark in the center, denoting the heart; sometimes, but not often, the lower limbs were added. The mark of Owaneco was uniformly a fowl or bird, sometimes suggesting the idea of a wild turkey, and again of a pigeon or smaller bird. This has led to the supposition that his name was identical with that of some bird, which he thus assumed for his totem or mark.

Among the earliest grantees under Indian deeds were Charles Hill, (1678,) Samuel Chester, (1683,) George Tonge and Daniel Fitch. Hill's tract of several hundred acres, was conveyed to him by Uncas, in exchange for Betty, an Indian woman taken captive in Philip's War, and given to Capt. James Avery, who sold her to Charles Hill.

In October, 1698, the General Court granted to John Winthrop, governor of the colony, and Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall, who preached the election sermon, conjointly, a tract of four hundred acres of land in the western part of the Mohegan fields. This tract was laid out by Capt. John Prentis, Feb. 20th, 1698-9. At a later period, (1705,) John Hubbard and Elisha Paine ran the bounds of this tract, and found it to contain eleven hundred and odd acres. It lay on the east side of Mashapaug or Twenty Mile Pond, above the farm of Samuel Rogers. This grant was the cause of long and angry controversy. The Masons raised an outcry against it; the neighboring colonies caught it up, and the reverberation was loud in England, where the

1 For suggestions respecting the derivation of the names Uncas and Owaneco, the author is indebted to Mr. Judd, of Northampton.

throne was led to believe that great wrong had been done the Indians by this giving away of their lands.

In the year 1705, when the queen's court of commission sat at Stonington, Capt. John Prentis testified that he had surveyed and returned about three thousand acres between New London and Norwich to nineteen different persons. At the same court it was stated that the following persons had settled on the Indian fields, viz., Samuel Rogers, Sen., Samuel Rogers, Jr., Benjamin Atwell, Israel Dodge, George Fevor, (Le Fevre,) Samuel Gilbert, James Harris, Thomas Jones, Sen., Thomas Jones, Jr., Philip Marsey, William Miner, (Mynard,) John Tongue, Richard Skarritt.

Others who had lands laid out to them were Governor Winthrop, Rev. Gurdon Saltonstall, Daniel Wetherell, John Plumbe, Caleb Watson, George Denison, Charles Hill, Jonathan Hill—all these were summoned as intruders between New London and Norwich.¹

Jan. 11th, 1709-10, Owaneco signed a deed of sale conveying five hundred acres of land to Robert Denison, of Stonington, for the consideration of £20, part in silver money, and the remainder in goods at money price.

This was followed, May 10th, 1710, by a conveyance of great import, being no less than a general deed of all the Mohegan lands between Norwich and the old town-line of New London, that had not been heretofore alienated—excepting only the eastern or sequestered part which was actually occupied by the tribe—to Major John Livingston, Lieut. Robert Denison, Samuel Rogers, Jr., and James Harris, Jr., in the proportion of two-fifths to Livingston, and one-fifth to each of the other partners. The price paid was £50. Livingston afterward purchased the share of Rogers, which made him the holder of three-fifths. This conveyance comprised several thousand acres.

At the same time a deed of feoffment, or trust, was executed in favor of the Hon. Gurdon Saltonstall, Capt. John Mason, Major John Livingston, Capt. Daniel Fitch and Capt. John Stanton, by which the eastern part, or sequestered tract, was forever settled on the Mohegan tribe, under the regulations of the feoffees and their successors, "so long as there shall be any Mohegans found or known of alive in the world"—excepting only some small parcels in the possession of others, which were to be confirmed to them: to wit, Capt.

1 At the court of commission on the Mason controversy in 1748, sixty-four persons were summoned as intruders on the Indian lands. This included planters scattered over the present townships of Montville, Colchester and Salem.

Daniel Fitch was to be secured in the enjoyment of his farm, and Major Livingston in the possession of the tract claimed by him. These important documents were signed by Owaneco, Ben Uncas, Cæsar, and several counselors and chief men of the tribe.

These proceedings gave great uneasiness to the inhabitants of New London, who regarded the Indian land as granted to them by the act of addition to the town, passed by the General Court in May, 1703, and expressly guaranteed by their patent. A town meeting was held July 17th, 1710, and a committee appointed to prosecute Col. Livingston and his associates before the Assembly, for a breach of law. This was the beginning of a struggle for possession, which continued many years. The North Parish was in an unsettled and disorderly state; no man felt secure of his title. The Indians being much courted and caressed in some quarters, became exacting, and self-important. It was not, however, the dissatisfaction of the Indians, but the selfishness and cupidity of various claimants among the whites, that was the real cause of the controversy. To benefit the Indians was but a pretense; they were mere tools used by grasping and uneasy men, to obtain their own selfish ends. Had the Indians been successful in their suit, and wrench'd from the hands of the English occupants every acre of the ground that they had inclosed and subdued, they would not have reaped the benefit themselves. Others would have grasped the prize, and the result would merely have been a change of ownership among the whites.

Owaneco died in 1710, and was succeeded by his son Cesar; who being young, inefficient and intemperate, the Assembly appointed Ben-Uncas, the brother of Owaneco, and certain chief men of the tribe, to act as his guardians. This left it uncertain whether the chief authority was vested in Ben-Uncas or Cesar. In 1713, the feoffees renewed their deed with the latter, and on the 10th of May, 1714, with the former—the conveyance being also signed by about fifty of the tribe, in token of approval. Capt. Daniel Fitch having been removed by death, two other gentlemen were nominated by the General Court, and added to the number of feoffees, viz., William Whiting of Hartford, and John Elliot of Windsor.

The gentlemen purchasers and the feoffees, declared that one great object which they had in view, in assuming the guardianship of the Parish, was the settlement of a minister, who should have for his charge the various classes within the precincts, whether proprietors, tenants upon Indian leases, or Indians themselves. New London regarded this as a mere pretext to obtain the lands, and uttered from

time to time bitter complaints. In September, 1713, she instructed her deputies to lay before the Assembly, "the oppression and hardships endeavored to be put upon the town, concerning the lands in the northern part of the township, and the pretense of a minister to be settled there"—praying the Assembly "to stop the proceedings of certain persons who were in a way to wrong the natives as well as to injure the town's rights."

A large farm in Colchester, lying north and west of Mashapaug, had belonged to Major Mason, and was, in fact, the farm that he had reserved to himself when he surrendered to the colony in 1660, the rights that the Indian sachems had made over to him. This farm had descended to his grandson, Capt. Peter Mason, son of Capt. Daniel Mason of Stonington—who, living near the Indians, and having a hereditary right to be their adviser, had acquired considerable influence among them. As a *Mason*, he was of course hostile to the deed of feoffment; and was therefore employed by the town of New London to obtain a counter cession of the Indian lands in their favor, so as to nullify the deed. Through his influence a great Indian council was held, and the selectmen of New London obtained from the young sachem Cesar, May 30th, 1715, for the sum of £100, a general deed of all the ungranted land "between Norwich and New London old bounds, and from Mohegan River westerly to Colchester and Lyme." This instrument declares that "the just right of purchase of said lands doth belong to the town of New London and no other," and that all former conveyances were void, having been fraudulently obtained by "taking advantage of the old age of my father Owaneco."

A series of town acts followed the execution of this deed. A sufficiency of land was secured to Cesar and his tribe, and the title to the remainder was vested in the proprietors of New London in certain proportions; reserving five hundred acres to Capt. Peter Mason, who assumed the payment of the hundred pounds gratuity. Against all these proceedings on the part of the town, Governor Saltonstall entered a stern protest. A paper, containing what he calls his *thoughts* concerning their measures, was read in town meeting, and recorded in book yii., where it covers six folio pages.

"I hear," he observes, "the bargain is cheap, not above £100 for the whole land put in trust—nay, I am told there is a project to bring that down to the insignificant sum of £3. You may be assured that its worth above ten times as much as the £100 pretended to be the price of it." He reminds them that they have already about

seventeen thousand acres of common or undivided land, within the ancient bounds of the town, and that it would be more for their interest as well as credit, to improve that to which they had an undisputed title, than to go about to make a purchase of Mohegan, while the title of it was under discussion in the common pleas.

The General Court refusing to confirm the acts of the town, the royal deed of Cesar became a nullity, and the town acts and grants based thereon, were made void. Cesar died in 1720, and the same year the Assembly appointed "James Wadsworth, Esq., Mr. John Hooker, and Capt. John Hall," a committee to settle all existing controversies, and provide for the settlement of a gospel minister at Mohegan. Two of these, Messrs. Wadsworth and Hall, met at the house of Mr. Joseph Bradford, on the Mohegan lands, Feb. 22d, 1720-21, and held a court of commission, with powers to hear, review and decide all disputes respecting the Indian lands. This court was eminently one of pacification; almost every claimant was quieted in his possessions; the deed of feoffment was confirmed, and the reversion of the sequestered lands, when the tribe should become extinct, settled upon New London. The commissioners ratified all the court grants—the farms of Winthrop and Saltonstall—six hundred acres to the New London school—two hundred acres to Caleb Watson—the purchase of Livingston and his associates, excepting only a tract of five hundred acres to be taken out for the use of the ministry—the claim of Campbell and Dixon, who bought of Owaneco and Cesar—the farm of Stephen Maples—the lease of Samuel Fairbanks¹—and, in general, all Indian engagements previous to 1710.

The tract of land to be reserved for the ministry, was left undetermined by the commissioners. The inhabitants could not by any means hitherto used, be brought to agree on a place where the meeting-house should be built, and it was desirable to lay out a farm for the minister as near to the meeting-house as should be convenient. This matter was therefore left unsettled, and at the request of the inhabitants, referred to the General Assembly.

The North Parish soon became tranquil. Governor Saltonstall, who had the accommodation of their difficulties, and the settlement of a minister among them very much at heart, exerted himself to allay animosities, to soothe troubled minds, and harmonize neighbor-

¹ Fairbanks had a lease from Owaneco in 1710, of one hundred and fifty acres, on condition of making and maintaining two hundred rods of fence. The feoffees added a new tenure—a yearly fat lamb, if demanded.

hoods. He lived to see his hopes realized. It was finally decided that the meeting-house should stand on Raymond Hill, and Jan. 17th, 1721-2, John Merritt and Mercy Raymond gave a deed of two acres of land, out of the farm then occupied by Major Merrit, to Capt. Robert Denison, Mr. Joseph Bradford, Mr. Jonathan Hill, Mr. Nathaniel Otis, and Ensign John Vibert, in trust for the inhabitants of the North Parish, for the site of a church, and for a church-yard or burial-place. A religious society being organized, Governor Saltonstall recommended them to engage the services of Mr. James Hillhouse, from Ireland, who was then in Boston. To him they applied, through the agency of the governor, offering him a salary of £100 *per annum*; and having received a favorable answer, Mr. Jonathan Copp was commissioned to go on and accompany him to the scene of his future labors.

Mr. Hillhouse preached his first sermons in the west room of Mr. Samuel Allen's tavern. In his church record he says:

"I was installed October the 3d day 1722.

"Mr. Adams preached from Acts 16: 9. There was Seven that belonged to the Church at my instalment—Capt. [Thomas] Avery, Capt. [Robert] Denison, Mr. Nath^l. Otis, Mr. [Samuel] Allen, Mr. [John] Vibber, Charles Campbell, and one Deacon. Mr. Jonathan Copp was chosen deacon of this Church and accepted it, Nov. 19, 1722."

This was the second Congregational church of New London. The meeting-house was raised July 11th, 1723. While it was building, Mr. Hillhouse made a brief visit to his father-land, but returned before the close of the year. The most commanding point in the parish was usually chosen by our ancestors for the site of a church. In this instance a wide and fair landscape was spread around the sacred edifice. To the south, the vision extends to Long Island Sound; on the east, to heights of land in Voluntown and North Stonington. A legion of lower hills fills all the intervening space; villages are concealed by foliage, or secreted in the valleys; only here and there a house upon a hill, a hamlet by a stream, or a spire rising above the trees, breaks the circumference of wood-land scenery. At that period it was literally a church in the wilderness; a solitary beacon in the center of a mighty forest.

In accordance with the style of architecture then prevalent, this meeting-house had greater breadth than length; the pulpit being placed in one of the sides of greatest extent. It had two tiers of free benches in the middle, a row of pews around the wall, three doors,

and gallery-stairs in two corners. The pews were built at the charge of the owners, and not completed till 1727. Those of greatest honor were each side of the pulpit, and each side of the door opposite the pulpit. These four pews were occupied by Mrs. Raymond and her son Joshua, Capt. Robert Denison,¹ Capt. John Mason and Madam Livingston, Mr. Joseph Otis and Major John Merritt. Only fourteen pews were built: the other seats were free.

About the year 1730, some unhappy difficulties arose in the parish, which ended in alienating a part of the people from their minister. Of this contest little is now known, except that it was protracted and violent. It is said to have commenced in a controversy between Mr. Hillhouse and his next neighbor, Capt. Denison, in regard to their respective bounds. An ecclesiastical council, convened by a majority of the parish, finding it impossible to compose the differences, dissolved the connection. This act Mr. Hillhouse considered illegal, as he had not concurred in calling the council, and therefore refused to relinquish his office. The congregation was now split into two assemblies, each claiming the house and the pulpit. Other ministers were employed by the majority of the congregation, but Mr. Hillhouse continued to exercise his functions after the settlement of a successor—his record of admissions to the church is continued to 1737, and of baptisms to August, 1740. He died December 15th, 1740, aged fifty-three.² To the registry of his death in the New London town book, the recorder adds this note:

"He was descended from a respectable family in Ireland, being the second son of Mr. John Hillhouse, of Freehall, (in the county of Londonderry.) Good natural abilities, a liberal education, and a well-tempered zeal for the truth, rendered him eminent and useful in the ministry in this place."

Mr. Hillhouse was educated at the University of Glasgow. His father had deceased before he came to America, and the family estate had devolved upon his elder brother. He married after his settlement, Mary, daughter of Daniel Fitch, one of his parishioners. He left two sons: William, born Aug. 25th, 1728, and James Abra-

¹ A special vote gave Capt. Denison liberty to build a pew for himself and heirs *forever*, in consideration for what he had given toward settling the gospel, viz., £42 to the meeting-house, ten acres of land to the ministry, and fifty to the minister. His pew was to reach from post to post, and be of the same width as the pulpit and deacon's seat.

² His estate was appraised at £6,906. Henry's Annotations, in the inventory, were estimated at £30.

ham, May 12th, 1730. His relict was subsequently twice married, and being made a widow for the third time, she returned to the North Parish, and dwelt with her children till her death. The inscription on her gravestone is peculiarly comprehensive:

"Here lies one who served near the Altar, having been the virtuous Consort of the Rev. Mr. Hillhouse, Rev. Mr. Owen and Rev. Mr. Dorrance. She died October, 1768. *Ætatis 62.*"

Between his installment in October, 1722, and the first of May, 1737, Mr. Hillhouse admitted to the church 198 new members and eighteen from other churches. Eight others (the seven pillars and deacon) formed the church before his installment. His record of baptisms comprises one hundred and eighty children and forty adults; marriages, thirty-five.

In 1738, Mr. David Jewett, who had been employed as a missionary to the Mohegans and was much in favor with the sachem and the tribe, being also acceptable to the people of the parish, was invited to become their minister. He accepted the call, and having been received as a member of the church, by dismission and recommendation from the church at Rowley, Mass., he was ordained, Oct. 8d, 1739.

An ordination at that period called forth a great concourse of people, and, what appears strange at the present day, was usually followed by a dance and supper that consumed most of the night. An ordination ball was as common as the ordination itself. Yet it must not be supposed that the clergy or any of the fathers in the church took part in it: it was the *congregation ball*.

No minister in the country stood higher among his own flock, or in the esteem of his brethren, than Mr. Jewett. He was a man of dignified deportment, rigorous in discipline, but very fervent in preaching and uniformly assiduous in his calling.¹

In 1750 the meeting-house was entirely out of repair. The buildings of those days were constructed of the most enduring materials, but the workmanship was clumsy and defective; the frame might last for ages, but the building was a ruin in one generation. The sacred edifice was again refitted and finished off in the neatest style of those days—"colored on the outside with lamp-black and Spanish

¹ The name of Mr. Jewett's wife was Patience Phillips. He married her in Cambridge or Boston. Though laboring under the disadvantage of having but one hand, it is said that she could use the needle and the distaff, and perform all other duties of a notable housewife, as well as most women with two.

lead, and the door and window-trimmings painted white." It was then prepared for a second term of twenty years' service.

In 1756 Mr. Jewett obtained leave of absence for several months, "being called by the providence of God to go into the army as chaplain." This was a service to which he was afterward very often called, not only during the French War, but in that of the Revolution. His animated manner and his energetic language made him very popular as an army chaplain.

Deacons of Mr. Jewett's Church.

Joshua Raymond, chosen May 23d, 1740.

David (son to Deacon Jonathan) Copp, chosen July 4th, 1746.

Joshua (son to Deacon Joshua) Raymond, chosen June 3d, 1763.

Joseph Otis, successor to Deacon David Copp deceased.

Joseph Chester, successor to Deacon Joseph Otis, who removed.

Jonathan Copp removed to the North Parish from Stonington in 1713, but was originally from Boston and of the family from which Copp's Hill derives its name.

Joseph Otis was from Scituate, Mass. In 1716 he purchased a large quantity of land in the North Parish, above Raymond's, and in Colchester, on which he and his family settled. He died in 1754 at the age of ninety.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Origin of the Fort Hill Baptist Church.—Gorton's ordination and ministry.—Rowe's legacy.—Internal strife and extinction of the church.

THE regular Baptists of New London go back for their origin almost to the dawn of the eighteenth century. The first account we have of their society is derived from a petition to the General Court in 1704, for "the settlement of their meeting." They called themselves "Dissenters;" stated that their society comprised six brethren and six sisters; that they had an ordained teacher with them viz., Daniel Pierce; and that they held their meetings at William Stark's.

After 1720 they increased in numbers and influence. They were joined by Joseph Gilbert and William Roe or Rowe, the latter an emigrant from England, and by Philip Taber from Rhode Island, who in 1726 purchased the farm of Capt. James Rogers on the Neck. On the 28th of November, 1726, Stephen Gorton was ordained their pastor, by Elder Valentine Wightman, of Groton. This was the third religious society established in the town. It became extinct before the end of the century; its history, therefore, will here be briefly pursued to its close.

This society united with their neighbors of the seventh-day persuasion in building a house of worship. The site was given by Isaac Fox and the title vested by deed of Jan. 9th, 1729-30, in the two societies known as "First and Seventh-day Baptists." The trustees were Samuel Fox, Samuel Wescote, Jonathan Rogers and Philip Taber. This meeting-house very well accommodated both societies, as they met on different days. It stood upon the rocky summit of Fort Hill; the ascent painfully precipitous on one side, but the position beautiful, commanding a fair expanse of the Sound. The edifice was square, small upon the ground, and high beyond a due proportion. This peculiarity obtained for it in later days the

familiar appellation of the *pepper-box*. The shell of the edifice—dismantled of pulpit, gallery, seats and windows; ghostlike and blackened by time—kept possession of the hill until the year 1847, when it was taken down.

Elder Stephen Gorton was born in Rhode Island, March 21st, 1703-4;¹ consequently he was but twenty-two years of age when ordained. He married, soon after his settlement, Sarah, relict of Jonathan Haynes and daughter of James Rogers 2d, a woman of piety and considerable estate, who was more than twenty years his senior (born in 1682) and had twelve children by her first husband.² Mr. Gorton was a man of good capacity and fluent oratory. It has been said that his knowledge was all self-acquired, except reading and writing, which were taught him by his wife. His marriage with Mrs. Haynes gave him respectability and influence. She died in 1766, aged eighty-four;³ after which he married again and almost immediately fell into disrepute. He is said to have imbibed Socinian principles and to have been low and irregular in his habits.

John Starke was the deacon of Elder Gorton's church. Its greatest benefactor was William Rowe, who among other donations gave a piece of land adjoining the meeting-house for a burial-place, vesting the title in the First-day Baptists, and providing in case of their extinction, that it should be held by churches of that denomination in Groton and Newport, "until there should be a First-day Baptist church in New London again." Mr. Rowe afterward removed to North Stonington and eventually to Canterbury, where he died. By his will, made in 1749, he left all his books of divinity and three hundred ounces of silver, or paper currency equivalent thereunto, for the use and support of the Fort Hill church and ministry. The money was to be *improved* and the principal kept good.

This church is understood to have held to open communion and the laying on of hands in immersion.⁴ The members were scattered over a wide area. Several lived in the town plot; Nehemiah Smith of East Lyme and Jonathan Rathbone of Colchester belonged to this church; and in 1781 several persons belonging to Wallingford,

¹ Recorded in New London at his own request.

² Trumbull says he married a *Connecticut girl*; he should have said a *Connecticut matron*.

³ See her gravestone in the Fort Hill burial-ground.

⁴ MS. sketch written by Rev. Henry Channing. He says: "The number of members never went over one hundred and fifty, I believe."

thirteen miles north of New Haven, united with it.¹ Philip Taber, one of the pillars of this church, died Dec. 27th, 1750. His religious views harmonized more particularly with the Six Principle Baptists of North Kingston, R. I., to whom he left a legacy in his will. The doctrines of this sect are based on Hebrews, vi. 1, 2.

During the latter part of Mr. Gorton's ministry, the church very much declined; the moral character of the elder was impeached, and the parties for and against him were fierce and vehement in their dissensions. Mr. Gorton was summoned before a Baptist convention in Rhode Island for trial, and though the main charges against him were not proved, his conduct was condemned as unworthy the office of elder, and the convention recommended his dismission. He would not, however, be dismissed, and having still a few followers, kept possession of the pulpit and the Rowe legacy, of which he was a trustee, and excommunicated those who had withdrawn from him—that is to say, more than three-fourths of the whole church. Thus things continued till the year 1772, when the withdrawn members having engaged Mr. David Sprague from Rhode Island for their leader, resolved on obtaining possession of the meeting-house and the annuity. On Sunday, June 7th, they collected together and proceeded to the house of worship, where they found Mr. Gorton officiating in the pulpit, with the communion table spread before him. One of the most resolute of the party ascended the pulpit, forcibly expelled its occupant, and drove him and his wife and their whole company from the sacred precincts. It has been said, also, that as he went down the hill, they threw his Bible after him. Of this act, however, the complaint afterward entered by the grand-juror against Mr. Taber as principal in this transaction, says nothing. It accused him of collaring Mr. Gorton, beating him out of the pulpit, and pushing away his wife when she came to his rescue. The indictment was for breach of the peace and profanation of the Sabbath. Mr. Taber was fined on both counts.²

Mr. Sprague's party had now possession of the house and Gorton's of the annuity. Actions in law were commenced by each against the other. The struggle issued in the utter extinction of the church as an independent body and the loss of their fund. The period of dissolution could not vary much from 1774. The members were

¹ Benedict, Hist. Bap.

² The particulars of this affair and the date of the year are taken from the record of the justice's court held on the occasion.

dispersed. Some of them united with another Baptist society in the western part of the town, which had originated in a meeting of the separatists about twenty-five years previous, and was then flourishing under the ministry of Elder Zadok Darrow.

Elder Gorton removed to the western part of the state and in 1779 was of *Southerton* (Hartford county.) He left behind him in New London no family, no church records, no faithful flock to lament his loss ; nothing but a dispersed congregation and a tarnished name.

Nehemiah Smith, who resided in the eastern part of Lyme, withdrew at an early period from the Fort Hill church and set up meetings in his own house, by which means Baptist principles became disseminated in the neighborhood. It is stated in Benedict's History of the Baptists, that Valentine Wightman preached in Lyme in 1727, and was "challenged by the Rev. Mr. Bulkley of Colchester to a public dispute, which was first maintained in a verbal manner and afterward kept up in writing." This preaching was probably at Nehemiah Smith's. A church was soon gathered in the vicinity and Joshua Rogers (also from the Fort Hill church) was ordained elder at the house of Mr. Smith, Oct. 11th, 1743. After officiating as pastor for ten or twelve years, he fell into disrepute and died by his own hand in 1756. The members of the church being few in number and scattered in point of residence, joined other Baptist societies as they were formed, and this the most ancient Baptist organization in Lyme, became extinct.

CHAPTER XXV.

Formation of an Episcopal society.—Building of a church.—Family of Seabury.—Ministers Seabury and Graves.—The church closed.—Unsuccessful attempts to procure a whig pastor.—The church burnt by the enemy.

REV. JAMES MCSPARRAN resided many years in the Narragansett country as an Episcopal missionary, sustained by the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts." His ministry there extended from 1721 to 1757. In a sketch of the colonies which he sent home to his patrons and which was published under the title of "America Dissected," in speaking of Connecticut he says: "I myself began one church by occasional visits among them, at a place called New London." The claim which Dr. McSparran thus advances to the honor of having founded the Episcopal church in New London, is undoubtedly valid. He was probably at first invited hither by the English residents of the place, and his zeal and energy soon enlarged the number of adherents to the church. The earliest entry on the parish records is as follows:

" Colony Connecticott, June 6, 1725.

"Wee the subscribers doe oblige ourselves to pay to the Rev. M^r James McSparran, or to his substitute, he being Treasurer, the particular sums annexed to our names for the building and erecting a Church for the service of Almighty God, according to the Liturgie of the Church of England as by law established.

John Merritt	£50	John Bennett	£3
Peter Buor	50	James Tilley	10
John Braddick	25	George Smith	3
John Gridley	10	Nath ^l Kay	20
James Sterling	25	James Packer	5
Walter Butler	10	Giles Goddard	5"

Most of these subscribers, but not all, were residents in New London. Gridley and Kay belonged to Newport. Buor, Tilley¹ and

¹James Tilley was from Edford, in Devonshire, England.

Smith were all Englishmen who had recently established themselves in the place. Braddick was of English birth—a son of Capt. John Braddick, then of Southold, Long Island, but “late of London.” John Merritt had been for some years a resident in the North Parish of New London, and had liberally patronized the Congregational church, built there in 1722. He died in 1732, but his widow, Mrs. Janette Merritt, and his grandson Merritt Smith continued in the Episcopal society. Bennett, Packer and Goddard, belonged in Groton; but the last named, Dr. Giles Goddard, soon removed to New London. Sterling was a sea-captain sailing from the port. Walter Butler is supposed to have been a native of the town,

The next recorded action was the formation of a standing committee, to purchase a site and erect the contemplated church. This consisted of seven persons—Messrs. Merritt, Buor, Sterling and Butler, before-mentioned, together with John Shackmaple, Thomas Mumford and William Norton.

Shackmaple was an officer of the customs, son of the collector Shackmaple, then recently deceased. It is probable that the meetings for worship before the erection of the church were held at the house of his mother Mrs. Sarah Shackmaple, in the northern division of Bradley St. Thomas Mumford was a merchant, trading in New London, but having his residence in Groton, upon the opposite side of the river. Norton is not a name belonging to New London, and is not mentioned after 1726.

The first proposition before the committee was this. The Episcopal society in Newport being then engaged in erecting a new church, it was proposed to apply for the old one; and if obtained, to take it down, bring it to New London and re-erect the whole edifice in its original proportions. Dr. McSparran went to Newport as agent in this business, but some obstacles arising, the plan was relinquished; and it was decided that a new church should be built, of smaller dimensions.

The site chosen for the edifice was a vacant lot on the Parade, which had been relinquished by the town to Amos Richardson, as a part of his original house lot grant. It consisted of about twenty square rods, lying in an angular form, the east end being in a line with the west side of Bradley Street, and the west end tapering to a point. Edward Hallam purchased it in 1725 of Richardson's heirs. It was now bought for £50 by Thomas Lechmere of Boston, who took the deed in his own name and then conveyed it to the committee of the society as a free gift—

"To erect thereon a church or decent edifice for the worship of God according to the liturgy of the Church of England, to be forever devoted to this sacred and pious use, to keep up a church thereon, and bury their dead thereon." Dated June 20th, 1726.

A building fund was raised by subscription. Considerable sums were given in Boston, Newport and Providence. In New York the aggregate sum of £75 was obtained through the agency of Capt. Matthew Norris, and among the donors are the names of Burnet Bayard, DeLancey, Duer, Morris and Van Rensalaer. Some contributions came also from Philadelphia. The whole sum raised was little short of £500.

The contract for building the church was made with Capt. John Hough. It was completed and opened for public worship in the autumn of 1732. The form was square,¹ fifty feet each way, "thirty-two feet height of studd and five windows, with two double doors on the west end, the roof half flat and the other half arched on each side." The original number of pews was twenty-two.

In 1741 a subscription of £182, was taken up by the minister and wardens—chiefly as they stated, "for enlarging our bell." In 1755 the edifice was thoroughly repaired, a new steeple built, the bell recast, and a clock added. As the congregation increased, a gallery was built with two tiers of pews, and attics above the gallery; and yet later, the space around the pulpit was diminished, and the south door shut up, in order to occupy the room with new pews. Repairs and improvements were again made in 1774.

The style used in the records is "The Episcopal Church of New London," until 1741, when it begins to be designated as "St. James' Church, New London."

A traditional anecdote connected with this ancient church is too interesting to be omitted. The steeple or belfry terminated in a staff, crowned with a gilt ball. In this ball an Indian arrow was fixed, hanging diagonally from one side and remaining there until the destruction of the church. It is said that a delegation of Indians passing through the place were courteously entertained by the elder Nathaniel Shaw. In traversing the town with their host, as they stood looking at the church, the war-chief of the party took an

¹ This was in accordance with Dr. McSparran's advice—"if built square, it may in time be lengthened and enlarged." The timber for the frame was furnished by Major Buor, and probably grew on his Bentworth farm. Among the items of expenditure is—Sept. 30th, 1726—"for drink at moving the frame £5."

arrow from his quiver, and fixing it in his bow, aimed at this ball. The arrow pierced the wood, and the barb was firmly fixed in the ball. "That," said the chief, turning with a triumphant smile to Capt. Shaw, "*make you remember Indian came here, and how he shoot.*"

Coincident with the establishment of an Episcopal church in New London, Mr. Samuel Seabury, a young minister of Groton, renounced Congregationalism, and embraced the doctrines and liturgy of the Church of England. This has been already mentioned in treating of the North Groton or Ledyard church; but a brief digression will here be made in order to introduce the father of the candidate, Deacon Seabury, to our history.

John and Samuel Seabury from Duxbury, Mass., appear in Connecticut, a little before the year 1700. Samuel in 1702 made purchases of land in Lebanon, but his name is not found on any early list of inhabitants in that plantation. John settled first in Stonington, where the birth of his son David is recorded Jan. 16th, 1699. In 1704 he exchanged his farm in Stonington for one in Groton, to which he immediately removed, and being shortly afterward chosen a deacon in the Congregational church is principally known to our local annals as Deacon John Seabury of Groton. His family was registered by the town-clerk as follows:

John Seabury married Elizabeth Alden Dec. 9th, 1697.

Children.

1. David, born Jan. 16th, 1699.	5. Samuel, born July 8th, 1706.
2. John, " and died in 1700.	6. Mary, " Nov. 11th, 1708.
3. Patience, " May 5th, 1702.	7. Sarah, " March 16th, 1710-11.
4. John, " May 22d, 1704.	8. Nathaniel, " July 31st, 1720.

The period of Deacon Seabury's death has not been ascertained. He was probably interred in the ancient burial-ground at Pequonuck, where sleep the two excellent ministers, Woodbridge and Owen, to whose church he belonged. His relict Elizabeth—a granddaughter of John Alden of the Mayflower—is interred at Stonington. She died Jan. 4th, 1771, aged ninety-four. It is inscribed on her grave-stone that she lived to see the fourth generation of her descendants.

Samuel Seabury, son of John, graduated at Harvard College in 1724, and being licensed as a Congregational minister preached several months in the year 1726 to the church that had been newly established in North Groton. He declared himself a convert to the Church of England in 1730, and the next year went to England where he received Episcopal ordination from the Bishop of London.

Mr. Seabury after his return to America, received a commission from the "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts," to exercise his sacred functions in New London, granting him a yearly annuity of sixty pounds, lawful money of Great Britain, with an arrearage, or payment backward "from the feast-day of St. John the Baptist which was in the year of our Lord 1730 :"

"*Provided always*, and on condition that the said Samuel Seabury do without delay at the first opportunity after the date hereof cause himself to be conveyed to New London aforesaid, and from and after his arrival continue to reside there unless otherwise directed by the said Society and do with fidelity and diligence discharge his holy function, otherwise this grant to be void."

May 19th, 1732.

Mr. Seabury met with the society at New London, April 10th, 1732. The first church officers were then chosen.

Church-wardens.

Thomas Mumford, John Braddick.

Vestry-men.

John Shackmaple, James Packer,
Matthew Stewart, Giles Goddard.

Thomas Manwaring.

Mr. Mumford officiated, either as warden or vestry-man, twenty-three years; and Matthew Stewart twenty-seven years. Samuel Edgecombe and Dr. Guy Palms were early and important members of the society: the former was vestry-man or warden, without interval from 1735 to 1767 inclusive.

Mr. Seabury though styled a missionary officiated in all respects as the pastor of the church. He remained in New London about eleven years. His residence during the latter part of the time was in State Street, in a house which he built in 1737, and sold in 1744 to Edward Palms. It is now the Brainerd homestead.

The first wife of Mr. Seabury was Abigail, daughter of Thomas Mumford. She died in 1731, leaving two children—

Caleb, born Feb. 27th, 1728.

Samuel, " Nov. 30th, 1729.

After his return from Europe Mr. Seabury married Elizabeth, daughter of Adam Powell of Newport, and had six other children.

Early in 1743, Mr. Seabury was transferred by the society under whose auspices he labored to Hempstead, Long Island. This removal was made at the solicitation of the people there and with his own consent. He lived pleasantly at Hempstead, occupying a small farm, and beside his pastoral duties engaging in the education of youth.

His last sermon is said to have been preached at New London, while on a visit to his relatives and former flock. Returning home from this excursion somewhat indisposed, he never went out again, but sickened and died, June 15th, 1764.

Before Mr. Seabury left New London the church applied to the society in England for a successor. In their letter to the secretary Feb. 26th, 1742-3, they observe—

“ The very great convulsions occasioned here and in diverse other places o this Colony by the breaking out of what is called the “ New Light” makes this a melancholy juncture to have our church empty and unsupplied.”

Several years elapsed before a successor arrived. Mr. Matthew Graves at length received the appointment; and his name is registered as present at a parish meeting April 11th, 1748. Previous to his arrival a glebe or parsonage had been secured for the use of the pastor. Land for this purpose had been freely given by Samuel Edgecombe on Main Street, “ four rods front and nine rods deep.” The title was not vested in the church, but in the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, for the benefit of the Episcopal church in New London. The house built upon this site about 1750 is still extant; and though much improved in style and convenience by the present rector, retains its original frame-work and most of its old interior arrangements. In the guest chamber, on one of the panes a text of Scripture is engraved with a diamond in a neat, fair hand, “ Thou art careful and troubled about many things, but one thing is needful.”

This is said to have been done by Rev. John Graves of Providence,¹ brother of Matthew, while lodging in the chamber, and was doubtless intended as a gentle admonition to his sister, Miss Joanna, who presided over the household concerns.

Mr. Graves remained in New London more than thirty years; exercising his functions discreetly, and living a blameless life. He preached often in Groton, Hebron and Norwich; was assiduous in his attentions to the sick, the poor and to prisoners in jail, and frequently united in worship with Christians of other names. Rev. Eliphalet Adams, the Congregational minister, of the town, in acknowledging the kind attentions of friends and neighbors at the trying

¹ Rev. John Graves as a preacher had a higher reputation than his brother Matthew. Mr. Hempstead writes, Nov. 23d, 1766, “ I went to the Church to hear Mr. Graves’s brother—a famous man.”

period of his wife's illness and death, observes: "The Reverend Mr. Graves prayed with us again and again with much sympathy."

It was said also that after the death of Mr. Adams he zealously encouraged the settlement of his successor. This was given as a reason by the wardens of St. Paul's Church in Narragansett, why they did not wish him to be transferred to them, as the successor of Dr. McSparran, in 1757.

"He has lately given great offence to his brethren and us, by being officious in settling a dissenting teacher at New London, and injudicious enough to be present at his ordination."

After the commencement of the Revolutionary War, Mr. Graves gave umbrage to the citizens at large, and even to a majority of his own parishioners, who were ardent whigs, by continuing to read the prayers for the king and royal family. No entry appears on the parish records betwixt April 17th, 1775, and November 13th, 1778. During this period the regular course of parish business was interrupted; no church officers were chosen, and no service was performed in the church. From the recitals of the aged we learn that Mr. Graves had been respectfully requested to desist from reading the obnoxious part of the liturgy, but with this request he declared that he could not conscientiously comply. It was then intimated to him that if he persisted it was at his peril, and he must abide the consequences. Accordingly the next Sunday a determined party of whigs stationed themselves near the door, with one in the porch to keep his hand on the bell rope, and as soon as the minister, who was aware of the arrangement, began the obnoxious prayer, which he did with a firm voice, the bell sounded and the throng rushed into the house. They were led on, it is said, by the brothers Thomas and David Mumford, both men of commanding aspect and powerful frame, who ascended the pulpit stairs, and taking each an arm of the minister, brought him expeditiously to the level of the floor. Some great outrage might have been committed, for mobbing was then frequent, and the rage against toryism unmitigated; but two resolute matrons belonging to the church, rushed forward, and placing themselves in front of the unfortunate clergyman, declared their intention of standing between him and harm. The Mumfords relinquished their prisoner, and the women protected him from the populace till he escaped by a side door and found shelter in a neighboring house. "He fled in his surplice to the house of a parishioner, who though a warm

whig, was his personal friend, and protected him from the violence of the mob.¹"

This was the last time that Mr. Graves officiated in New London. After the mob dispersed, the doors were locked, and it was regarded as too hazardous to attempt the renewal of the services for the next three years.

"At a parish meeting Nov. 14th, 1778.

"Put to vote, that no person be permitted to enter the church and act as a pastor to it, *unless* he openly prays for Congress and the free and independent states of America, and their prosperity by sea and land."

The vote on this question stood fourteen to eleven, but several being challenged as having no right to vote, the issue was ten on each side.

"Voted, that the church-wardens wait on the Rev. Mr. Graves and let him know of the foregoing vote, and if it be agreeable to him, he may reassume the church of St. James, and officiate as pastor thereof, he praying and conforming to said vote. If so, he may be admitted to-morrow, being Sunday, 15th Nov. Agreeable to the above, we the church-wardens waited on the Rev. Mr. Graves, and acquainted him with the resolve of the parishioners, to which he replied, he could not comply therewith.

THOMAS ALLEN, } Church-
JOHN DESHON, } Wardens.

This determination rendered Mr. Graves so unpopular that it was considered undesirable for him to remain at New London. In August, 1779, Mr. Shaw, the naval agent of the port, sent a flag of truce to convey him to New York, where he died suddenly, after only two days' illness, April 5th, 1780. He was never married; a maiden sister who had always resided with him in New London, went with him to New York, and returned lonely and disconsolate after his death.

"June 25th, 1780.

"Voted, that Mrs. Joanna Graves has liberty to enter the parsonage house after the 29th August next, and enjoy one bed room and one lower room, until a minister is called to officiate in the church of St. James."

This venerable lady afterward removed to Providence.

Officers of the church were again chosen in September, 1779:

¹ Rev. R. A. Hallam. See His. of Narragansett Church, by Updike. Many versions of this event, the dragging of the English minister from the pulpit, and the locking up of the church, have been current. The author has endeavored to give a clear statement; but being drawn from discordant materials, it may not be entirely correct.

Thomas Allen, first warden; John Hertell, second. These are the last on record under the old order of things, and continued nominally in office until the torch of the invader laid the greater part of the town in ruins.

The church was again opened, though not for Episcopal service, in January, 1780. The Congregational society, to whom the Rev. William Adams was then preaching, was allowed the use of the church for their services, by a vote of the parishioners, "during the severity of the season, and the pleasure of the church." This was an accommodation, as the Congregational edifice was on the summit of a bleak hill, and that winter one of unprecedented severity.

The next year and the next, attempts were made to revive the Episcopal service.

"At a parish meeting June 25th, 1780, Thomas Allen, moderator, voted that the church wardens call on the Rev. Mr. Tyler, of Norwich, to officiate in the church, or any gentleman that will officiate as he does, *respecting the prayers*, as Mr. Lewis, or H. Parker, of Boston, or Mr. Freeman."

"April 16th, 1781.

"Voted that the wardens call on some Rev. gentleman to officiate in the church of St James, *i. e.* as Rev. Mr. Jarvis, or Mr. Hubbard do."

No pastor was, however, procured. The church was destroyed in the general conflagration of September 6th, 1781. We may suppose that of the numbers who after this catastrophe stood in sad contemplation gazing upon the ruins, very few felt a sharper pang of grief than John Bloyd, who had been for many years the sexton. He had kept the key, and taken charge of the edifice during the whole period of the war; to him doubtless it was a cherished object of affection, and the view of its smoldering heap must have carried desolation to his heart.¹

¹ A subscription for Bloyd's benefit was circulated by the wardens in 1786. He was afterward the first city crier.

CHAPTER XXVI.

The Great Awakening of 1741.—Preaching of Tennent, Davenport and others. Act of Assembly in May, 1742.—Separate society formed.—The Shepherd's tent.—Accessions to the church.—Burning of the books.—Trial of the book-burners.—Descriptions of the scene by Trumbull and Peters.—Whitefield's visits.—Ministry and death of his friend Barber, of Groton.

THE years 1740 and 1741 were distinguished by the greatest revival of religion ever known in New England. Great was the power of preaching. The state of society was very much renovated by its influence. But the stream did not flow every where in a clear and smooth current. Sometimes it was turbid, and often lashed into a foam. Most of the leading ministers and magistrates of Connecticut beheld its progress with distrust and fear. Hence arose divisions in the churches; the seceders being at first called New Lights and Congregational Separates, but most of them coalescing afterward with the Baptist denomination.

In New London the fervor of excitement commenced with the preaching of three sermons by Mr. Gilbert Tennent, March 30th, 1741; at noon, at three P. M. and in the evening. Night-preaching as it was termed, was at that period very unusual. Mr. Tennent had large congregations; not only the whole throng of the town's people attended, but the farmers came in with their families. The next day he preached four times, to still increasing numbers, the assembly being swelled by accessions from the neighboring towns. April 1st, many from this throng accompanied him to East Lyme, to hear him again, and others joined the train along the road.

Meetings now became very frequent: the neighboring clergymen assisted each other in weekly lectures, being all greatly enlivened in their exercises; and the assemblies unwontedly large and devout. On the 19th of May, the children of the town were assembled, and short sermons were addressed to them in terms adapted to their com-

prehension ; they were arranged in ranks according to size and age, the boys in one company and the girls in another. Toward the end of that month, Mr. Mills, of Derby, arrived in town, and Mr. Eells, of Stonington, came over ; these joining Mr. Adams, a series of lectures were preached, forming what would now be called a protracted meeting. "The whole week," says Hempstead, writing on the 6th of June, "hath been kept as a Sabbath, and with the greatest success imaginable. Never was any such time here, and scarce any where else. The wonderful works of God have been made evident in the powerful conviction and conversion of diverse persons in an extraordinary manner."

On the 16th June, the Rev. Mr. Parsons, of Lyme, an earnest revivalist, came to New London at the express invitation of Mr. Adams, in order to reconcile if possible, the two parties which had sprung up, and threatened a rupture in the congregation. He preached two sermons, one at the meeting-house, and the other in the evening, at the dwelling of Mr. Curtis. In an account afterward published by Mr. Parsons, of the part he took in the great revival, speaking of this visit to New London, he observes :

"The success was not according to my wishes. I found mutual rising jealousies, and as I thought groundless surmisings in some instances, prevailing among them. These difficulties increased afterward ; and for want of charity and mutual condescension and forbearance, they have produced an open separation."

The two parties consisted of the new converts, who exhibited a flaming zeal, and those who opposed the work, being excited probably to this opposition by the imprudence of the converts.

Mr. James Davenport, of Southold, Long Island, the most ardent and renowned enthusiast of this exciting period, preached his first sermon at New London, on the 18th of July. The service was at the meeting-house, and held in the evening. Hempstead, in his diary, thus describes the scene :

"Divers women were terrified and cried out exceedingly. When Mr. Davenport had dismissed the congregation some went out and others stayed ; he then went into the broad alley, which was much crowded, and there he screamed out, 'Come to Christ! come to Christ! come away! come away!' Then he went into the third pew on the women's side, and kept there, sometimes singing, sometimes praying ; he and his companions all taking their turns, and the women fainting and in hysterics. This confusion continued till ten o'clock at night, and then he went off singing through the streets."

Mr. Davenport visited also the North Parish, and preached in his

customary violent and denunciatory manner. The Rev. Mr. Jewett, pastor of the church, declining to give him an account of his religious experience, he declared in public that it was his opinion, or at least his great fear, that Mr. Jewett was an unconverted person.

From New London the preacher passed over to Groton, where he held meetings four or five days successively, to audiences of about one thousand persons. On the 23d of July, he continued the meeting till two o'clock in the morning, and some of the hearers remained all night under the oak-tree where he preached, or in the meeting-house. "About sixty," says Hempstead, "were wounded; many strong men as well as others."

On the 24th he preached in the west meeting-house in Stonington, where it was said near 100 persons were struck under conviction.¹ The meeting was much disturbed, "hundreds crying out." The next day he ascended a rugged knoll near the meeting-house, and with a rock for his pulpit, proclaimed his message in the open air. "Several were wounded," says Hempstead, "but not like yesterday." The next day, Sunday, he made his appearance at the center meeting-house in Stonington, where Rev. Nathaniel Eells was the pastor. Not being invited into the pulpit, he took his station under the trees near by, where he condemned Mr. Eells for his want of fervor and spirituality. This severe way of judging their minister, was so distasteful to his audience that it gradually melted away; most of the people joining the regular congregation in the meeting-house.

Itinerant preaching was a new element in the Congregationalism of New England, and did not assimilate well with the ancient constitution. On the 24th of November, a grand council of ministers and messengers, delegated from all parts of the colony, met at Killingworth, as directed by an act of Assembly, to discuss the whole subject of traveling ministers; the disorders occasioned by them; the odium they brought upon settled ministers, and the countenance they gave to Separatists. This council condemned as disorderly, all preaching of one minister, within the parish of another, without his leave. In conformity with this ecclesiastical decision, the General Court, in May, 1742, enacted a stringent law, directed chiefly against irregular ministers and exhorters; entitled "An act for regulating abuses and correcting disorders in ecclesiastical affairs." The general association of ministers of the colony met at New London, in June, and endorsed this new law with the seal of their approbation.²

¹ Great Awakening, p. 155.

² Trumbull.

Under this law, Mr. Thatcher, (probably Rev. Peter Thatcher, of Middlebury,) was arrested for preaching at the house of Mr. Curtis, in New London, on the 24th of June, carried before a justice and sentenced to be sent from constable to constable out of the colony. In execution of this sentence he was forwarded, June 26th, to the Groton constable, who allowed him to return to New London the same night, where he pursued the same course of preaching and exhorting as before, though more privately, and no further notice appears to have been taken of him by the authorities. The law was a violation of the rights of conscience and of personal freedom, so manifest and unjustifiable, that it could not be long enforced.¹

At this period, New London county was regarded abroad as the focus of enthusiasm, discord and confusion. A letter to Mr. Bellamy, from Rev. David Brainerd, often himself classed among enthusiasts, alludes to the false zeal and disorderly condition of the churches in New London and Stonington. He writes from Saybrook, February 4th, 1742.

“Last week I preached for Mr. Fish, of Stonington; the Lord helped me to be all love there, while I was [pleading] for religion, so that if they had any intention to quarrel with me; the Lord helped me to love them all to death. There was much false zeal among them, so that some began to separate from that dear man. He desired me if I wrote to you to remember his affectionate love to you, and tell you he wanted to see you in those parts more than any man on earth; and indeed I believe you might do service there if the Lord should help you to softness. There is, I believe, much false religion in sundry of those eastern towns. I preached also at New London, where I conceive there is wild confusion, too long to mention; if you should see Mr. Pierpont, of New Haven, he could tell you something.”²

At the communion service on the 29th of Nov., 1742, it was noticed that five prominent members of Mr. Adams' church were absent; viz., John Curtis, Christopher and John Christophers, John and Peter Harris. This was the nucleus of the party that assembled by themselves, at each other's houses. The deadness of the church and the legal preaching, as they termed it, were the reasons they gave for secession. They and others associated themselves into a separate society, and were qualified by the county court to hold meetings and worship together, without molestation. Mr. Timothy

¹ “It fell in a few years and buried the party which enacted it in its ruins.” Great Awakening, p. 239.

² Extracted from the original unpublished letter furnished the author, by Rev. Tryon Edwards, of New London.

Allen from West Haven was their teacher.¹ Mr. Jonathan Hill was an exhorter, and many others took a similar part.

After a time the house of Samuel Harris (Truman Street, corner of Blinman,) was fitted up for this society, and called "The Shepherd's Tent." It was intended to be an academy or institution for educating young men to become exhorters, teachers and ministers. How many resorted to it, is not known. Mr. Allen resided with his family in the same building and kept his school for initiates in the upper part.

In the meetings of the Separates at the Shepherd's Tent, laymen and women were allowed freedom of speech, and a relation of Christian experience was usually expected from those who attended.² There is no doubt but that in most cases, all things were done decently and in order, but sometimes when the excitement was great, preaching, praying, singing and exhorting, all went on together, and confusion was the inevitable result. The whole number that withdrew from the congregation of Mr. Adams was afterward estimated at 100.

All the churches in New London county participated more or less in the great awakening. Mr. Jewett of the North Parish of New London after a time entered into it with glowing zeal. The revival in his congregation began under the instrumentality of Mr. Parsons of West Lyme in December, 1741. He preached there two successive days, and about twenty persons were regarded as converts. In the evening of the second day, just after the blessing was pronounced and the usual service closed, (Mr. Parsons observes), "a wonderful outpouring of the Spirit" was experienced. Mr. Jewett had returned from Lyme where he had been to supply the pulpit in exchange with his friend, and coming in to the assembly during the exercises, received a new baptism from on high. "He seemed to be full of life and spirit from the Lord."³ From that time all dissen-

1 "July 10th, 1742. I was at Mr. Miller's with the rest of the authority to speak with Mr. Allen a suspended minister who is come here from New Haven west side, and sets up to preach in private houses." Hempstead.

2 "Feb. 2d. Nath. Williams of Stonington lodged here. He went over in the evening to the Shepherd's tent and there related his Christian experiences in order to have their approbation, but behold quite the contrary, for they upon examination, find him yet in an unconverted state, and he confesses the justice of their judgment; and says that he hath judged others diverse times, and though he is unwilling to believe it, yet like others he is forced to bear it." Ibid.

3 Parsons.

tion in his church disappeared, and those that had been on the point of separation from his ministry now "had their hearts wonderfully united to him."

Messrs. Owen and Croswell of Groton had also visits from the revivalist preachers, whom they welcomed with genuine sympathy. Mr. Croswell, in July, 1742, took up the pen in defense of the course pursued by Mr. Davenport, who had been severely censured in resolutions emanating from the associated churches of Boston and Charlestown in Massachusetts.¹

The principal accessions to the church of Mr. Adams were in 1741 from May to September inclusive. In this period eighty members were received; during the next three months only four. The Seceders, however, kept up the life and fervor of their zeal for two or three years: and their meetings continued to be marked "with great cryings out of many." The magistrates of the town sometimes interfered with warnings and reproofs but in general they were allowed to conduct their worship in their own way.

Early in March, 1743, Mr. Davenport again visited New London; sent hither with a message from God, as he averred, to purify the little company of Separatists from some evils that had crept in among them. His mind was in a state of fervid exaltation, amounting to frenzy. Bodily ailments and overstrained faculties had so disordered his reason that he could no longer keep within the bounds of order and propriety. On Sunday evening March 6th, a strange scene was exhibited. This was the time of the burning of the books; which has been regarded as the most conspicuous instance of fanaticism which occurred in New England during this period of religious enthusiasm. Of this transaction unfortunately, no account has been left by an eye-witness.²

According to report, Mr. Davenport preached one of his impetuous exclamatory sermons on the necessity of forming a pure church. In order to do this the candidates must cast away every kind of idol; and as one species of idolatry, he denounced certain religious books which had been worshiped as guides, and exalted into standards of faith, but which, he said, contained false doctrines and misled men to

1 Great Awakening, p. 244.

2 Hempstead, whose diary has been so often quoted was at this time at Long Island. On the preceding Sabbath, (Feb. 27th,) he had heard Mr. Davenport hold forth at Southold and his description of the service prepares the mind to believe that he might reach any degree of extravagance. He says, "The praying was without form or comeliness."

their ruin. He urged his hearers with great vehemence, to cast away, burn up, and utterly destroy every object which had been regarded with idolatrous veneration. The power of Mr. Davenport over the sympathies of an audience, was very great, and at the close of his service when a call was made upon the people immediately to purify themselves by renouncing idolatry, the whole congregation responded to the proposition. It was then proposed to repair to a certain place, each with his idol and his heretical books, and there to make a bonfire and utterly consume them. This extravagant demand was acceded to with enthusiasm and alacrity. A fire was immediately kindled upon the open space near the town wharf, fronting the house of Mr. Christophers, where it is probable the sermon was preached, and thither in the dusk of night hastened a throng of infatuated people of both sexes, each with books, or sermons, or some article pleasing to the sight or engaging to the thoughts of its owner, which he, or she, with loud ejaculations of prayer or praise, cast vehemently into the fire.

Women, it is said, came with their ornamental attire, their hoops, calashes and satin cardinals; men with their silk stockings, embroidered vests and buckles. Whatever they had esteemed and cherished as valuable must now be sacrificed. Most of the articles were of a nature to be quickly consumed, but the heavy books lay long upon the smoldering heap, and some of them were even adroitly rescued by lookers on, though in a charred condition. A copy of Russell's Seven Sermons, which was abstracted from the embers with one corner burnt off, was long preserved as a memorial of this erratic proceeding.

This ebullition of misguided zeal appears to have operated on the troubled minds of those engaged in it, like a storm upon the moody atmosphere, dispersing the mists, calming the air, and cooling the temperature. From this period the New Light party in New London took reason and discretion for their guides and interpreted more soberly the suggestions of conscience and the commands of Scripture. Reports of what had been done however, flew abroad on the wings of the wind, and all the regular clergy were alarmed. The burning of books so highly esteemed in the country, works of eminent dissenters and other evangelical divines, was almost considered sacrilege. On the 30th of March a council of ministers met at the house of Mr. Adams to solace him under his trials with their advice and sympathy, and to consult respecting "the disorders subsisting among those called New Lights." The ministers present were Edwards of

Northampton, Williams of Lebanon, Lord of Norwich, Meacham of Coventry, Pomeroy of Hebron, Bellamy of Woodbury, Rosseter of Stonington and the younger Buel of Coventry. On the 31st Mr. Edwards preached a sermon very suitable to the times, as bearing witness against the prevailing disorders, caused by enthusiasm."¹ After which a great concourse of people repaired to the court-house where the actors in the scene of burning the books were to have their trial; writs having been filed against them on the plea of profaning the Sabbath.

"At a Court held in New London, in the county of New London March 31st, 1743, and continued by adjournment to the 5th of April, 1743. Present J. Hempstead justice of the Peace.²

John Curtiss, Timothy Allen, Christopher Christophers, Daniel Shapley, Tuthill, and Sweasy being arrested and brought before this Court (upon the presentment of one of the grand-jurors of our Lord the King) to answer to the complaint exhibited against them, for that the persons aforesaid did on the 6th day of March instant, being Sabbath or Lord's Day gather themselves together with divers other persons unknown, (being some of them inhabitants of New London, and some of them transient persons) in the Town Street in New London aforesaid, near the dwelling-house of Edward Robinson of New London, and being so gathered together did there and then profane said day by kindling a fire in or near the street aforesaid and by throwing into said fire sundry good and useful treatises, books of practical godliness, the works of able divines, and whilst said books were consuming in the flames, did shout, hollow and scream, &c. (as per writ dated March 29th, 1743.)

"And the parties defend; say they are not guilty; and for plea say that they are members of a Society allowed by the Statutes of William and Mary in the first year of their reign to worship God according to their own consciences, in a way different from that established in, and by the laws of this Colony and were most of them qualified at the County Court in this County before the day aforesaid, according to said statutes, and the rest were by them then called to assist as teachers and persons to join in worship with said Society; that on the day mentioned in the writ, they all with many others were assembled for worship accordingly and that they in their consciences were then persuaded that heretical books in their custody ought publicly to be burned, that they accordingly burned those they thought to be such, that the same was solemnized with prayer, and singing praises to God, and that nothing in itself immoral was committed by them therein—that in that burning, praying and singing in such their separate society, was what they then judged in their consciences *Duty* and agreeable to the word of God, Acts 19, 19, and is the same mentioned in the writ, and no other things were done, nor with other view or motive.

"The case is considered and it is the opinion of this Court that they are all

1 Hempstead.

2 Copied verbatim from a report of the case found among the papers of the justice who presided.

of them severally guilty of the profanation of the Sabbath, or Lord's Day, contrary to the laws of this Colony, and therefore give judgment that they the said John Curtis, &c. pay a fine of five shillings each and the cost of prosecution; taxed at £1, 18s, 8d, to be proportionably paid between them being 6s, 5½d, each, Old Tenor. In Lawful money the fine for each is 15d, and the part of the charge to each 1 shilling 7½d."

"C. Christophers paid his part in Court, and John Curtis to constable Burch."

It will be observed that here is not a hint given that aught was cast into the fire except books. This being the most heinous part of the offense, it was the only count mentioned in the indictment. We have Davenport's own admission that articles of apparel formed part of the heap. Nevertheless rumor and imagination have without doubt greatly embellished the scene.

One thing is certain—this little company of enthusiasts never accomplished their favorite idea of forming a pure church under a divinely appointed teacher. They fasted and prayed, once it is said for three successive days, hoping that God by some sensible token would point out the man to preside over them; but no sign was granted, nor could they ever agree upon a leader. Mr. Allen left them soon after the burning of the books. In a few years the society ceased to exist, but several of the members united with a small company of Separatists that assembled in the western part of the town under the leading of Nathan Howard.¹

Mr. Davenport was ordered by the General Assembly to leave the colony and prohibited by penalties from returning. He subsequently recovered from his delusion, confessed his errors, and wrote a recantation, which was published in Boston in 1744. In this tract he particularly deplores and condemns the burning of the books and *clothes* in New London, an act which he admits originated with him, and in the execution of which he took a prominent part.

It is now allowed that Mr. Davenport was a man of piety and talent, very powerful and persuasive in his pulpit efforts, and setting aside these four or five years of enthusiasm in which he seemed transported into the regions of fanaticism, and in a manner beside

1 "A leading woman among these New Lights formed a small party whose distinguishing tenet was celibacy and went so far as to separate man and wife; however she was the first to marry, and her little party mostly joined the Moravians. The leading lady becoming a widow turned to the Muggletonians of whom a small party was formed here, headed by one Champlin from Rhode Island, and now supported by Roger Gibson from Glasgow." [The above extract is from a manuscript of Rev. Henry Channing written about 1790.]

himself, his life was passed in usefulness, peace and honor. Mr. Allen also, appears to have been carried through the storm without shipwreck and wafted into the pacific sea. He was a young man at the time that he presided in the Shepherd's Tent, and after that event officiated with acceptance in the sacred office for nearly sixty years.¹

The historian of Connecticut, Trumbull, gives the following account of the burning of the books.

"In New London they made a large fire to burn their books, clothes and ornaments, which they called their idols; and which they determined to forsake and utterly put away. This imaginary work of piety and self-denial they undertook on the Lord's day and brought their clothes, books, necklaces and jewels together in the main street. They began with burning their erroneous books; dropping them one after another into the fire, pronouncing these words: "If the author of this book died in the same sentiments and faith in which he wrote it, as the smoke of this pile ascends, so the smoke of his torment will ascend forever and ever. Hallelujah! Amen!" But they were prevented from burning their clothes and jewels. John Lee of Lyme, told them his idols were his wife and children, and that he could not burn them; it would be contrary to the laws of God and man: That it was impossible to destroy idolatry without a change of heart, and of the affections."

It is understood that the historian derived his account from tradition and the detail is undoubtedly as accurate as could be obtained from that source, sixty years after the transaction. But the imprecations said to have been uttered may be reasonably doubted. In that day such language would probably have been construed into blasphemy and made a strong point in the indictment, which, however, under this head, charges the offenders with nothing worse, than *shouting and screaming*; and they in their plea, admit only that they accompanied the sacrificial rite, with prayer and singing praise to God.

In the History of Connecticut, usually accredited to Rev. Samuel Peters, of Hebron, the chief agency in burning the idols is ascribed to Whitefield, who is represented as crying out from the pulpit:

1 In the year 1800, he was pastor of a church in Chesterfield, Mass.; aged eighty-five. One of the charges exhibited against him in the trying time, and for which he was suspended by the ecclesiastical body to which he belonged, was, that he had compared the Scriptures to an old almanac. This, which was spread through the land to his discredit, was not, according to his own explanation, made in his defense, a fair statement of his words. He had said, "The reading of the Holy Scriptures without the concurring influence and operation of the Spirit of God will no more convert a sinner than the reading of an old almanac." The manner of expression he himself afterwards lamented.

"Repent—do violence to no man—part with your self-righteousness, your silk gowns and laced petticoats—burn your ruffles, necklaces, jewels, rings, tinselled waistcoats; your morality and your bishop's books—this very night or damnation will be your portion before the morning dawn."

"The people," says the historian, "rather through fear than faith, instantly went out on the common, and prepared for heaven by burning all the above-enumerated goods, excepting their self-righteousness, which was exchanged for the preacher's velvet breeches."

It is scarcely necessary to state that the association of Whitefield with this scene, is inaccurate, and that the whole account is a burlesque. Mr. Whitefield's first visit to New London county was in 1745, two years after the book-burning. Some minutes of his preaching and progress in this vicinity, may appropriately be connected with the subject of this chapter.

In the course of Whitefield's tour through New England, in the summer of 1745, he arrived at Norwich August 1st, and remained there several days. He preached in the North Parish of New London August 9th, and in New London town-plot, the 10th, taking for his text, 1 Peter, ii. 7, first clause of the verse. On Sunday, 11th, he preached twice in the open air, standing under an oak-tree, in his traveling chair, the horse having been taken from it. We are not informed where this oak-tree stood, but most probably it was near the old meeting-house, on some part of the present Town Square. His morning text was from Rom. xiii. 14, first part: afternoon, Rev. iii. 20. The assembly was large; people from Norwich, Stonington and Lyme, attended. The next day he went to Lyme, followed by crowds, who could not be satisfied without hearing more of his rich eloquence. His wife came through town toward night, on her way to join him. She was in a chaise, accompanied by two men on horses, and lodged at Solomon Miner's, on the way to the Rope Ferry. From Lyme, the whole party crossed over to Long Island.¹

Before Mr. Whitefield again visited New London, his intimate friend, the Rev. Jonathan Barber, had been settled as minister in the neighboring town of Groton. Mr. Barber was born at West Springfield, Mass., January 31st, 1712;² graduated at Yale College 1730. In 1734, he was employed as a missionary among the Mohegans. In 1740, he met with Whitefield, and being favorably inclined to

1 Hempstead.

2 From his grave-stone in Groton.

ward him beforehand, became almost immediately his disciple, his admirer, his associate, his devoted, loving and beloved friend.¹ Whitefield returned his affection with ardor, and persuaded him to take charge of the Orphan House, established by him in Florida. Here he remained about seven years. Returning to the north, Mr. Barber was ordained at Oyster Ponds, Nov. 9th, 1757, but not settled over any church.² He was installed over the first or South Society in Groton, Nov. 3d, 1758.

Mr. Whitefield again visited New London in 1763. He crossed the Sound from Long Island, Monday, Feb. 6th, and preached on Wednesday evening, in the Congregational meeting-house, from Phil. i. 21. The next day he proceeded to Boston.³ In June of the same year, he returned from Boston by way of Providence. He traveled in his chariot, and stopped in Groton at the house of Mr. Barber, where he was received as a welcome and much honored guest.

Notice had been given of his coming, and at ten o'clock next morning he preached, standing on a scaffolding that had been extended for the purpose, on a level with the second story of Mr. Barber's house, and upon which he stepped from the chamber window. All the area around was thronged with the audience. Many people had left home the day before, or had traveled all night to be upon the spot. At the conclusion of his discourse, he entered his chariot and went on his way, a multitude of people accompanying him on horses, or following on foot to Groton ferry, four miles. After crossing the ferry he was received by a similar crowd on the Town wharf. He remained in town but an hour, and then proceeded on his journey to the south.⁴ This was his third and last visit to New London.

Mr. Barber's house, where Mr. Whitefield preached, is still standing, in the village which is now called Center Groton. Down to the year 1832, when the house was occupied by a daughter of Mr. Barber, an original portrait of the eloquent preacher, his own gift to his friend, still hung against the parlor wall.

Mr. Barber was an enthusiast: he had associated not only with Whitefield, but very much with Davenport. Many excellent men in

¹ See an interesting account of the first meeting of Whitefield and Barber, in Tracy's *Great Awakening*, p. 86.

² Prime's *Long Island*, p. 188.

³ *New London Gazette*.

⁴ *Hempstead*.

that day, were believers in impressions, impulses and ecstacies.¹ Imagination was trusted more than judgment, and transports of feeling were valued beyond the decisions of reason. Such a state of things naturally tends to destroy the equilibrium of the character. Despair, melancholy, mania, are but a step distant from the religious enthusiast. The last years of Mr. Barber were passed under a thick cloud ; his reason obscured ; the healthy tone of his mind destroyed. In this state of alienation, dark, distressed and melancholy, he suddenly died Oct. 8th, 1783. He had not preached for nearly twenty years. The society record says, "he was taken from his usefulness in the last part of the year 1765."

¹ Great Awakening, p. 100.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Change of style.—A Spanish vessel long detained in New London and part of its cargo stolen.—Execution of Sarah Bramble.—Col. Washington in town.—Another memorial on fortification.—The French Neutrals.—Incidents of the war.—The Greens, a family of printers.—Issue of the New London Summary.—Loyalty.—Lotteries.—Various articles of intelligence. Issue of the New London Gazette.—The British ship Cygnet.—Barberries.—Pope-day. Revenue oppression.—Trade.

It is well known that in the month of September, 1752, an interruption occurs in the dates, occasioned by the correction of the style. Hempstead's diary, next after September 2d, has the following entry :

“ Sept. 14, 1752.—Fair:—and such a day as we never had before! By act of Parliament to bring Old Style into New Style, eleven days is taken out of this month at this place, and then the time to go on as heretofore.”

On the 28th of November, 1752, a Spanish vessel struck on Bartlet's Reef, a little west of the harbor of New London, and sustained so much injury as to be rendered entirely helpless. Capt. Richard Durfey, in the custom-house barge, went out to her relief. She was found to be of that description of vessel called a snow; of two hundred tuns burden; with a crew of forty men, and named “the St. Joseph and St. Helena.” On her voyage homeward from the gulf of Mexico to Cadiz, she had encountered severe gales, and was so much damaged that her commander had bent his course toward New London to refit, and was endeavoring to enter the harbor, when the accident occurred. She was richly freighted with indigo, and other valuable products of the Spanish colonies, and had on board sundry chests, boxes and kegs of gold and silver, in bullion and coin. It was necessary to lighten the ship, and Capt. Durfey brought away thirty-seven chests of dollars, and three of gold in doubloons, with other goods, which were stored in the cellar of Col. Saltonstall's dwelling.

house in Main Street. All the forms of law were satisfied in the way of taking evidences, acknowledgments, and receipts, and a guard of six men was detailed to watch the money. The arrival in port of so large a treasure, magnified and varied by rumor, threw the town into a ferment, and the report of it ran like wild-fire through the country. The violent and lawless part of the community were eager to get a portion of it, either by fair means or foul.

The snow being lightened, floated from the reef, and was towed up to the wharf, where she was unladen, and the remainder of her goods stored in Robert Sloan's warehouse, near the Town wharf, with a guard of four men to keep watch over them.

And now a controversy arose between the colonial and the custom-house officers, which party should have the custody of the treasure. The governor, having had prompt advice of the situation of the foreign vessel, had commissioned Col. Saltonstall to act for the colony; but the collector, Joseph Hull,¹ Esq., claimed the whole cognizance of the affair. He and his assistant, Mr. Chew, proceeding to make an appraisement and examination of the cargo, were met by the refusal of Col. Saltonstall to deliver up that part of it which was in his charge. Violent disputes ensued, and a court of admiralty was called to decide the question. The session was held in the court-house, December 18th, and the judge, deciding in favor of the custom-house, issued an order to Mr. Hull to have the Spanish effects appraised and taken into his custody.

On the 28th, Mr. Hull, with the judge's order in his keeping, accompanied by a justice of the peace and a throng of followers, some armed with clubs, and himself flourishing a naked cutlass, proceeded to the house of Col. Saltonstall, and demanded the treasure. The latter, having received the governor's commands to keep the goods till further order should be given, was prepared to contest the point. They found his house surrounded by an armed guard, and two constables at the gate, one of whom read the riot act to the approaching company, and ordered them to disperse. Violent altercation, but no bloodshed ensued; the invaders gave up the point, and departed, though in great anger.²

The snow, upon examination, was condemned as unseaworthy; and the severity of winter now coming on, the Spaniards abandoned all hope of departing till another year's sailing-time should come round.

¹ Erroneously, *Hill*, in Trumbull's History of Connecticut.

² "Much rolled," is Hempstead's expression.

Early in the spring of 1753, a vessel was procured for them ; and no good reason seems to be given why they did not forthwith demand their goods and put to sea. At least, the cause of the detention is not now known. According to Trumbull's account, a part of the cargo was shipped on the 23d of April, and nothing appeared but that the whole was ready for delivery at that time.

It would have been a relief to the town to have them depart; for the business kept the authorities of the place embroiled, and collisions frequently took place between the Spanish crew, and the low part of the populace with whom they associated; so that street fights were frequent. Delays, however, took place; and when at last Don Joseph Miguel de St. Juan, the supercargo, was ready to receive the remainder of his effects, they were not to be found. A portion of the money, a large part of the indigo, and some of the other goods were missing. The injured foreigner demanded his property of the collector; he knew nothing about it: of Col. Saltonstall; he was equally ignorant: no one knew aught of the matter; all were in the dark. The Spaniard was resolute, not to depart without his full cargo, or its equivalent. He spent the summer in waiting, soliciting, threatening and demanding, but obtained no redress. In October, he presented a memorial to the Legislature, stating the facts, demanding indemnity, and throwing the case upon the colony for adjudication. It was his plan, since he could not obtain the whole of the cargo, to retain the remainder, deliver it into the hands of the authorities, discharge his crew, and go home to his sovereign with his complaints, leaving the colony responsible for the whole concern. The Assembly declined to interfere any further than to empower the governor to aid in a public search after the missing treasure.

It was due to the reputation of individuals, to the town and to the colony, that the whole affair should have been thoroughly investigated. Governor Wolcott¹ was censured for not showing more activity

¹ According to Trumbull, the unpopularity growing out of this affair, lost Wolcott his election the next year. A political ballad of rather later date, (probably never printed) has this verse:

" Who next succeeded to the helm
Was stately smoking Roger:
The same to Cape Breton had been,
But was no seaman or soldier.
During his cruise a Spanish *Snow*
Fired on him a broad-side, Sir,
He received a wound by a golden ball,
And of that wound he died, Sir."

in behalf of the foreigners ; Col. Saltonstall for not having safely kept the treasure ; the town authorities for not preventing the robbery, and Mr. Hull for taking no better care of property intrusted to him. The country was agitated with rumors that enhanced the value of the effects embezzled, and increased the numbers of the guilty.

That the foreigners had been robbed was too evident to be disputed ; and suspicion very naturally fell upon the watchmen appointed to guard the treasure. Among those who had been on guard at Col. Saltonstall's, were four young men upon whom rumor fixed—and it was soon whispered around that they had been furtively traced in the hush of night, to the recesses of Cedar Swamp, in the rear of the town, and there, upon a knoll of dry ground, they had been seen dividing, by lantern-light, a shining heap of gold. These men were arrested, together with a fifth person, supposed to be a receiver and confederate. An examination took place before the magistrates, and one of the men turning evidence for the prosecution, related the whole affair. He stated that they were on guard at Col. Saltonstall's ; that the treasure was kept in a vault or inner cellar, between strong stone walls ; but the weather being inclement, the guard were allowed to take shelter in an outer cellar, where beer was provided for their refreshment. The contiguity to so much gold, fired them to possess it, and yielding to the temptation, they laboriously dug under the partition of the stone-wall, and with ropes and hooks contrived to extract a box in which was about an equal amount in bulk, of gold and silver—the silver in dollars, and the gold chiefly in doubloons—a thousand of the former, and five times that value of the latter. Having obtained the treasure, they hastened to Cedar Swamp, and digging a hole upon Griffing's Island,¹ they poured out the gold and buried it, and hurrying back with the box, filled it with stones and gravel, and replaced it in the vault from which it had been abstracted, carefully filling up the hole, and obliterating all traces of their criminal night work. Afterward, at their leisure, they exhumed their gold and divided it, each concealing his portion in some place unknown to the others.

This was not the only robbery said to be committed upon the unfortunate Spaniards. During the night of December 16th, 1753, Sloan's warehouse was broken open, and several ceroons of indigo

¹ A name given to a knoll of upland in the heart of Cedar Swamp.

abstracted. That part of the cargo that had been shipped, was also found to be diminished ; indigo and bags of dollars had been carried off while the vessel lay at the wharf. Such were the tales disseminated by rumor, but they were undoubtedly much exaggerated. It is probable that the thefts were all petty, except that at the Saltonstall cellar. Three other persons, however, were arrested and imprisoned. But early in the spring, before any trial of the culprits had taken place, they escaped from confinement and fled. It appears that the whole company were kept in one apartment, and iron crows being furnished them from without, in the night of March 11th, 1754, they broke down the door of the jail, and making directly for the river, seized the first boat they found, and rowed out of the harbor without being pursued. They were eight in number, but this included one or two that had been arrested on other charges. What became of them afterward is not known. No vigorous attempts were made either to retake the fugitives, or recover the treasure. Unfortunately many persons had loose notions concerning the fraud and dishonesty of the act. It was Spanish property, in custody of an officer of the king's customs : at the worst the king would have to pay for it ; it was but cheating the king, that is to say, the revenue, which was no worse than smuggling, and many were guilty of that, who passed for honest men. By this delusive mode of arguing, the culprits who had carried off the ingots of the Spanish sovereign, were shielded from the obloquy and punishment they merited.

The Spanish commander had not failed to transmit to his sovereign an account of the difficulties in which he was involved ; and in consequence, a complaint was carried from the court of Madrid to that of St. James, against the colony of Connecticut and the king's officers at New London. A ship of war, the Triton, of forty guns, was immediately sent by the British ministry, with dispatches to the province, and orders to remain in or near the harbor, and render assistance if necessary. The Triton arrived in port early in November ; a Spanish merchant came also as agent from his court with full power to act in the premises. The General Assembly likewise issued a commission to Jonathan Trumbull and Roger Wolcott, to repair to New London, investigate the whole affair and bring it to a just issue. By the united endeavors of all these parties, the matter was somehow accommodated, but the result is all that is known of their action. The remaining cargo of the St. Joseph was stowed on board of a vessel provided by the Spaniards, in charge of Don Miguel de St. Juan,

which left New London during the first week in January, 1755.¹ The commissioners having seen all accounts settled, left New London on the 9th; the Spanish agent took passage in the Triton, Capt. Whitford, which left the harbor on the 25th of the same month. It was scarcely to be expected that this affair would here terminate. Future trouble to the colony, arising out of it, was apprehended. Nations have sometimes plunged into war on slighter grounds; yet it seems to have been overlooked and forgotten by the powers on the other side of the ocean. New London as a town had nothing to do with this affair, and its records do not contain a single reference to it. It was regarded as belonging to the admiralty, and business of that description, being usually contested between the colony and the custom-house, there was but a slight chance of its being well managed.

The specie thus fraudulently obtained from the Spaniards, came forth very gradually from its hiding-places, and crept into circulation. Some of it buried in swamps and outlands, may have been irrecoverably lost. Some Spanish dollars were at one time dug up at low water mark in Water Street, that were supposed to have belonged to the St. Joseph. A stone pitcher filled with doubloons, was found several years afterward, by two negro lads, in Cape Ann Lane. While engaged in ferreting out a rabbit, they threw down a part of the wall, and found the golden prize secreted below. This had probably been the portion of one of the four young men who had gone into exile. The two lads very judiciously lodged their treasure in the hands of a friend, who purchased their freedom with a portion of it, and divided the remainder with exact justice between them. It did them no good, however; they spent it in dissipation, and acquired by it habits of idleness and improvidence. Such chance treasures are seldom beneficial to the finder.

Other deposits of the Spanish money are said to have been found, by one and another, who, however, kept their good luck as secret as possible. It was only discovered, or inferred from circumstances. If a poor man rather suddenly became possessed of funds for which his neighbors could not account, was able to purchase land or build a house, the readiest supposition was that he had found a box of Spanish dollars or a bag of doubloons.

¹ The whole history of this affair is placed by Trumbull under the running date of 1753. As above stated the Spaniards came into the harbor in November, 1752, and the town and colony were kept in a state of tumultuous agitation, until they departed in January, 1755.

The indigo of the St. Joseph is said to have been carried into the country and sold by peddlers. Stories were circulated of a white mare that was led about from place to place far into the interior, with its sides blue with the indigo that had sifted through the panniers. The burlesque and romantic incidents growing out of this affair, ought not to blunt our conviction of the turpitude of the robbery. Every generous mind must regret that a company of foreigners, coming hither in distress, and throwing themselves upon our hospitality for aid and protection, should have been thus wantonly plundered.

November 21st, 1753, Sarah Bramble was executed in a cross highway that leads out of the main road to Norwich, about two miles north of the town plot. This path has ever since been known as Gallows Lane. It is a rugged, wild and dreary road, even at the present day. The fearful machine was erected in the highest part of the road, and all the hills and ledges around must have been covered with the spectators. It was computed that 10,000 assembled on this occasion; some of them probably came twenty or thirty miles to witness this repulsive exhibition. The gloom of the weather added another dismal feature to the scene, a drizzly rain continuing most of the day.

This is the only public execution of any white person that ever took place in New London. The crime of the unhappy woman was the murder of her infant illegitimate child, on the day of its birth. It was committed in April, 1752, and she was tried by the superior court the next September. But the jury disagreeing in their verdict, she was kept imprisoned another year, and sentenced October 3d, 1753. She declined hearing the sermon intended for her benefit, which was preached by Rev. Mr. Jewett, before the execution.

The year 1755 was marked by another rupture between England and France. The Hempstead diary mentions (April 1st) the arrival of Governor Shirley and suite, on their way to Virginia, to meet General Braddock. Recruiting officers were about that time busy in the place, and soldiers were sent off under Capt. Henry Babcock, to join the army of the frontier. The news of Braddock's defeat was brought by a special post, bound to the eastward, July 22d, and accounts of the battle at Lake St. Sacrament, (now called Lake George,) arrived September 16th. In March, 1756, Colonel Wash-

ington was twice in town, tarrying a night, both in going and returning from Boston.

"March 8th. Colonel Washington is returned from Boston and gone to Long Island, in Powers' sloop ; he had also two boats to carry six horses and his retinue, all bound to Virginia. He hath been to advise with Governor Shirley, or to be directed by him, as he is chief general of the American forces." [Hempstead.]

Two days after the transient visit of Washington, we find the inhabitants assembled in town meeting to discuss the oft-recurring question of fortifying the harbor. It was resolved to present a memorial on the subject to the General Assembly. The colonial treasury, however, was not sufficiently replenished to allow of the necessary disbursements, and no aid was obtained from this source. The next spring, (March 8th, 1757,) a vote was passed to apply to the Right Honorable John, Earl of Loudon, who had been appointed commander-in-chief of his majesty's forces in America. A memorial was accordingly drafted, representing the defenseless state of the town and harbor, entreating him to afford such aid as he should judge meet, and soliciting his kind offices in stating their case to his majesty. It is probable that this memorial was not presented.

It may be thought that these applications to powers abroad ; the high-toned remonstrances and threatened appeals to the king, which occur in the course of our history, display an overweening self-importance on the part of the inhabitants. But some apology may be found in the imminence of their danger, and what appeared to them the apathy of the home administration, in regard to their case. The town was not, perhaps, a favorite in the colony : unlike others, it always had a populace ; it frequently voted wrong ; harbored foreigners ; was often boisterous and contentious ; manners were too free ; actions too impulsive : in short, it had less of the Puritan stamp than any other place in Connecticut.

Coincident with the action respecting the memorial to Lord Loudon, the case of "*the French people*," was discussed. The selectmen were desired to find accommodations for them at some distance from town, and to see that they were kept at some suitable employment. These persons were the French neutrals, that had been dispossessed of their homes in Nova Scotia, and were scattered in small and lonely bands all over New England. A vessel with 300 on board came into New London harbor, January 21st, 1756. Another vessel, thronged with these unhappy exiles, that had sailed from Halifax early in the

year, and being blown off the coast, took shelter in Antigua, came from thence under convoy of a man-of-war, and arrived in port May 22d. Many in this last vessel were sick and dying of the small-pox.

Probably more of these neutrals were disembarked at New London than at any other port in New England. A special Assembly convened by the governor, January 21st, 1756, to dispose of these foreigners, distributed the 400, then on hand, among all the towns in the colony, according to their list. The regular proportion of New London was but twelve, yet many others afterward gathered here. Some of the neutrals were subsequently returned to their former homes. In 1767, Capt. Richard Leffingwell sailed from New London with 240, to be reconveyed to their country.

The clearing of Nova Scotia from the French, opened the way for the introduction of English colonists. Between this period and the Revolution, the tide of emigration set thitherward from New England, and particularly from Connecticut. Menis, Amherst, Dublin and other towns in that province, received a large proportion of their first planters from New London county.

The campaigns of 1756 and 1757 demanded yet more and more soldiers from New England. The diary so often quoted contains some allusions to the war, which will serve to show how far New London was interested in the enlistments and in the privateering business to which the war gave life.

May 10th, 1756. "I was at Col. Lee's¹ to take leave of some of my neighbors who are going in the expedition to Crown Point; only thirty marched off; they are waiting for arms from Boston."

May 10th. "Two sloops are transporting Boston soldiers to Albany."

May 30th. "It is sickly at the camp at Fort Edward."

November 1st. "Training of the first and second companies, to enlist ten men, five out of each company, and a large subscription made, to be equally divided between them."

May 15th, 1757. "Capt. Leet² came in from a six months' cruise; no prize."

June 12th. "Capt. David Mumford, in a New London privateer, fell down to Harbor's Mouth."

June 17th. "A prize schooner taken by David Mumford³, from the French, in latitude 33° arrived."

¹ This was Col. Stephen Lee, of Lyme, but at that time resident in New London, where he had married Mary, relict of John Picket.

² Capt. Daniel Leet, originally from Guilford. He married Mehitable Savell, of New London. Miss Sally Leet, the venerable daughter of this couple, is yet living, and though nearly 100 years of age, appears still to enjoy life.

³ From the newspapers of that day it is ascertained that Capt. Mumford was afterward taken by the French, and carried in to Martinico.

August 8th. "This morning before sunrise, a post came in from the Governor and informs that Fort William Henry was invaded on Wednesday last, with 11,000 French and Indians, thirty cannon and some mortars, 4,500 Canadians, as many Indians, and 2,000 regulars."¹

August 11th. "One quarter of the whole militia of the town marched for Albany, to defend the country; Jonathan Latimer, captain; John Rogers, lieutenant."

August 14th. "The melancholy news is confirmed of the loss of our upper fort at the Lake George or Sacrament."

April 5th, 1758. "The first and second companies in arms to enlist soldiers for the expedition against Canada."

June 10th. "Jonathan Latimer, Jr., and his company of soldiers entered on board a sloop at Gardiner's wharf, (to sail for Albany.) A French prize schooner is brought in by two privateers of Providence; seventy-five tons, ten guns and seventy-five men."

The 18th of August, 1758, was distinguished in New London by a great and general rejoicing, on account of the surrender of Cape Breton to the English. More than 200 guns were fired from the fort, and the vessels in the harbor. The next day the festivities were continued, and in the midst of the general joy, Capt. James Gardiner, was accidentally killed.² He was loading a cannon at the Harbor's Mouth battery, and while putting in a second charge, the piece went off, and laid him dead upon the spot.

We have already adverted to the first printer in the colony of Connecticut, Thomas Short, who died in 1712. The governor and company invited Timothy Green, of Cambridge, to take his place. He accepted the offer and came with his family to New London about the year 1714. This was a valuable accession to the society of the town. Green was a benevolent and religious man, and was soon chosen deacon in the church. He was also a most agreeable companion, on account of a native fund of humor and pleasantry always at his command. This is said to be a prevailing trait in the Green family. The house and printing-office of Deacon Green were in the upper part of Main Street.³ He died May 5th, 1757, aged seventy-eight.

Deacon Green had five sons. *Jonas*, one of the oldest, and born before the family came to New London, settled in Maryland, and

¹ An instance of the exaggeration of rumor. Montcalm's army is estimated by historians at 8,000 or 9,000.

² Capt. Gardiner had been out during the war 'cruising against the French, in a snow called the Lark. He was of the Newport family of Gardiners, and his wife Anne Robinson, of New London.

³ On or near the spot where is now the dwelling-house of Nathaniel Saltonstall.

was the second printer of that colony, reviving, in 1745, the *Maryland Gazette*, which had been first printed by William Parke. *Timothy* settled first as a printer in Boston, in partnership with *Kneeland*. *Nathaniel* and *John*, lived and died in New London, leaving no male posterity. *Samuel*, on arriving at maturity, was associated with his father in the printing business, but died before him, in May, 1752, leaving a family of nine children, three of them sons. Immediately after this event, *Timothy Green*, from Boston, removed to New London and took charge of the business, instructing the sons of his deceased brother *Samuel* in his art. These three sons all became printers. *Timothy*, the second, settled in New London, and established the second newspaper in the colony,¹ the *New London Summary*, a small weekly half-sheet, first issued August 8th, 1758, and continued for five years and two months.

The publication of the *Summary* covers a period, which those historians who are admirers of military glory would call a shining page in the annals of the English colonier. Louisburg, Quebec, Montreal, taken; all the French dominion on the northern frontier reduced, and a series of brilliant successes in the West Indies, in which the colonial troops had an honorable participation, mark this era. Enlistments were the order of the day; a band of volunteers from New London county were with the armament that effected the conquest of Martinico; a still larger number joined in the expedition against Havanna. But the colonies were exhausted by efforts of this nature, and were still further perplexed and impoverished by the illiberal restrictions laid by the mother country upon their trade.

New London suffered largely in this line of calamity. Her vessels, bound to the West Indies, before they could arrive at their port, were seized by British cruisers lying in wait, and sent into Jamaica, New Providence, or some other port for trial. Under pretense that they were engaged in what was called the flag of truce trade, meaning an unlawful commerce with the king's enemies, many vessels and their cargoes were condemned and confiscated. Bankruptcies were the consequence. With New London, it was one of those stagnant and depressed periods to which all seaports are liable, and which

1 The first newspaper in Connecticut was the *Connecticut Gazette*, commenced in New Haven Jan. 1st, 1755, by Parker and Holt—discontinued in 1767, and succeeded by the *Connecticut Journal*, established by Thomas and Samuel Green, the other sons of Samuel, of New London, deceased. Thomas had previously established the third newspaper of the colony, the *Connecticut Courant*, in Hartford, 1764. See Thomas' *History of Printing*.

they will continue to experience while the rivalry and wars of nations exist. Not only fortunes were cut down, but families were thinned. In tracing the lines of genealogy, we find groups of names that can be traced no further than maturity. The records do not tell of their children; their graves are not found in our burial-places. All we know is that they disappear from their places, and a knowledge of the history of the times leads us to suppose that they fell miserable victims to those terrific expeditions, to the north or the south, which often came for their deadly tribute, drawing life-blood from the heart of the country.

September 8th, 1760, Montreal surrendered to Gen. Amherst; the entire reduction of Canada was involved in the capitulation. This event was celebrated at New London, September 22d. The bells were rung; the guns of the battery, and smaller pieces in other parts of the town, thundered forth their joy, and in the evening there was a general illumination of the houses. Oct. 30th was celebrated as a day of public thanksgiving, in honor of this event, both in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The sermon at New London, preached by Rev. Wm. Adams, was published.

The interests of America were then more intimately connected with European politics than at the present time. The successes of the Prussian monarch gave general satisfaction. The victory over Marshal Daun, November 3d, was celebrated by a public rejoicing in New London, in the early part of January, when the news of the event was received.

Feb. 2d, 1761, George III. was proclaimed. No. 132 of the *Summary*, contains an account of the festivities of the day. "The civil officers, officers of the customs and admiralty, ministers of the gospel and every gentleman in town whose health would allow of his being abroad," assembled. The proclamation was read by the high sheriff, and assented to, "with sincerity of heart and voice, by every one present." The whole company dined together. "The health of his majesty, and may he live long and reign happily over us," was drank with a royal salute of twenty-one guns. Other toasts, heartily echoed, were—the glorious king of Prussia; Mr. Pitt; General Amherst; and success to the grand expedition. At night, sky-rockets went up, and bonfires illumined the town.

The king's birth-day appears to have been, for several years after this period, duly and heartily celebrated, sometimes by a public dinner, and at others, by private entertainments. Perhaps the last time that the waning popularity of the sovereign elicited this demonstra-

tion of loyalty, was June 4th, 1767. On that day, Col. Harry Babcock, of Westerly, gave a great dinner at his residence to various gentlemen from the neighboring towns. A field-piece, planted in his garden, responded to the toasts as they were drank.

A very popular mode of raising money at this period, was by lotteries. Churches and bridges were erected, streets repaired, and other public works were carried on by lottery; and sometimes individuals largely indebted, were authorized to satisfy their creditors in the same way. Conspicuous instances of this mode of settling an involved estate, occurred in New London, in the cases of Robert Sloan and Matthew Stewart, merchants, who had suffered severely from the war, their vessels being cut off by French privateers. The Legislature granted a lottery to the trustees of Mr. Sloan's estate in 1758, and to those of Mr. Stewart in 1759. Four extensive farms belonging to the latter, were thus converted into money. They were surveyed into fifty-four lots, and appraised at £9,698. The lottery consisted of these fifty-four land prizes, and two thousand money prizes of-forty-eight shillings each. Tickets twenty-four shillings.

In 1760, a lottery was granted to build a light-house at the entrance of New London Harbor.¹ This was the first light-house upon the Connecticut coast. Near the rocky ledge chosen for its site, members of the Harris family have dwelt since the first generation from the settlement. The particular spot on which the house was erected, was sold to the governor and company by Nathaniel Shaw, Jr. It was part of the inheritance of his wife, Lucretia, only child of Daniel Harris. In 1801, this structure was superseded by another, built by the general government, which had assumed the charge of the light-houses of the country.

The beautiful beach along the mouth of the river, north of the light-house, was for many years used as a kind of quarantine ground. At various periods, the small-pox has been a scourge to the town. Between 1750 and 1760, vessels were continually arriving with this disease on board. The selectmen were the only health officers, and it fell to them to dispose of the sick, and to the town to defray most of the charges. At the White Beach and Powder Island, such ves-

¹ A light-house of some sort had previously been erected at the mouth of the harbor. Allusions to it are found after 1760, but nothing that shows when it was built, or how maintained.

sels were usually stayed, and there many a victim to the perilous infection, was cast into the earth as a thing utterly abhorred.

In 1761, the first alms and workhouse was established. A house and land was purchased, on what is now known as Truman Street, (corner of Blinman,) and the expense covered by a penny tax on polls and assessments on persons who had encroached upon the highway. Some eight or ten conspicuous encroachments were thus compounded for and legalized, to the manifest detriment of the streets. This house was occupied by the town's poor till 1782, when it was discontinued, and for several years paupers were provided for by contract.

1763. A town vote granted liberty to Wm. Potter, to build a wharf on the highway next north of the fort, for the benefit of the ferry, during the town's pleasure. This is now Ferry Wharf.

Dec. 1765. "Voted, that the thanks of the town be returned to Capt. Stephen Chappell, for extraordinary care and pains as surveyor of highways, in discharging that office to so good satisfaction and applause, and that the vote be recorded in the town-book as a memorial to his honor."

1766. The first cart-bridge over Bream Cove was built this year; the contractor was Lieut. Christopher Reed. On the 19th of November, a bear was killed on the Norwich road, three miles from town, near Wheeler's. It weighed two hundred and forty pounds—was dressed and brought into town to market. Hundreds, for the first time, tasted of bear's meat.

1767. This year the first fire-engine appeared in town. It was presented to the inhabitants by Nathaniel Shaw, Jr., who had procured it from Philadelphia.¹ A house was built for it upon the

¹ In a letter from Shaw to his correspondent, Thomas Wharton of Philadelphia, is the following passage relating to this engine:

"In Mr. Goddard's paper No. 9, I see that a Fire Engine is advertized for sale by Daniel Elly Esq. I should be obliged to you to engage it for me, if it be a good one, and ship by Capt. Harris." (Shaw's Letter Book.)

Church land on the Parade, by permission of the wardens and vestry of the church. How this engine escaped the conflagration that destroyed the church and a great part of the town, at the time of the British invasion in 1781, is not known. Perhaps it had been previously removed elsewhere. In June, 1785, after the incorporation of the city, this old engine, being inspected and found worthy of repairs, was forwarded to New York for that end, and on its return in 1786, a regular fire-company was established, to take charge of it. This was the first fire-company in town. Ebenezer Douglas was appointed captain, with authority to enlist twelve men, whom he was to exercise once a month. The city engaged to pay the personal highway-tax of those who enlisted.

The *New London Summary* was discontinued in October, 1763, three weeks after the death of its publisher. Probably no entire copy of it is now extant. A glance at its advertisements will furnish us with hints from which, by comparison, we may estimate the advances made since that period. A trip to New York, in a packet schooner, was then an undertaking of some moment. "Sept. 26th, 1760, John Braddick will sail for New York in about six days. For freight or passage, agree with him at his house." In the next issue of the paper, (October 3d,) the same advertisement is continued, and, October 10th, under head of "Custom-house cleared out," is "Braddick for New York."

"Jan. 30th, 1761. No Boston mail this week."

The most conspicuous stands for merchandise, were those of Joseph Coit and Russell Hubbard, on the Bank, and William Stewart, on the Parade. Roger Gibson, recently from Edinburgh, and Patrick Thompson and Son were on Main Street, and Thomas Allen near the Ferry Wharf. Goods were curiously intermixed in the assortments: "London babes" (dolls) and Kilmarnock caps stood side by side with Cheshire cheese. Amos Hallam kept a house of entertainment for gentlemen travelers, near the Ferry Wharf, sign of the Sun. Capt. Nathaniel Coit another, on Main Street, at the sign of the Red Lion.

Dr. Thomas Coit was the principal physician. He had nearly the whole medical practice of the town for forty years, commencing soon after 1750.

Richard Law was the most prominent attorney. He was a younger son of Governor Jonathan Law, of Milford; graduated at Yale College, 1751; practiced law a short time in Milford, and settled in New London about 1757.

A return of the shipping of the district of New London, (which it must be remembered included at this time the whole colony,) for the year 1761, gives the following result:

Forty-five vessels, one thousand six hundred and sixty-eight tuns, forty guns, three hundred and eighty-seven men.

In this list were eight brigs and brigantines, forty-five to sixty-eight tuns, seven schooners and thirty sloops. The guns belonged to two brigantines, King George and Britannia, (each fourteen,) and the schooner Fox, (twelve.) The Britannia had a crew of fifty men. Coasters and packets were not included—adding these, the whole Connecticut fleet amounted to about eighty sail.

The above list is certified by Joseph Hull, collector, Jeremiah Miller, naval officer, and Joseph Chew, surveyor. Hull is supposed to have come into office as successor to John Shackmaple, who died in 1743.² Nicholas Lechmere was one of the naval officers of the port in 1750; but was afterward transferred to Newport, and made controller of the customs there. Jeremiah Miller was a grandson of Governor Saltonstall, and the only native of the town that is known to have held an office in the king's customs. Joseph Chew was an emigrant from Virginia, who settled in the place before 1750.³

In 1762, Thomas Oliver was appointed collector of the district. He was an Englishman, who had been a resident of New London at intervals since 1747, and perhaps held some previous office under the king.⁴

In 1764, he was superseded by the appointment of Duncan Stew-

¹ The original is among the Trumbull papers in the library of the Mass. Hist. Soc., Boston.

² This was the second John Shackmaple. His wife Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Christophers, married in 1754, Thomas Allen. Capt. John Shackmaple, of the third generation, died in 1767, and with him the male line in New London became extinct.

³ His father was Thomas Chew, of Virginia, and his mother a daughter of Col. James Taylor, a gentleman who stands as progenitor to two of the Presidents of the United States—James Madison and Zachary Taylor. Mr. Chew, after his removal to New England, corresponded with his cousin, the elder James Madison, Bishop of Virginia, who was his coeval in birth, almost to precision, the two cousins having been born respectively on the seventh and eighth of April, 1720.

⁴ He is called Captain Oliver, and had probably been a sea captain in the West India trade. His will was executed in New London, December 22d, 1770, but not proved till 1790. It bequeathed all his property, whether in New London or Antigua, to his nephew, Richard Oliver, of London, appointing another nephew, Thomas Oliver, of Cambridge, his executor. This last mentioned gentleman was lieutenant governor of Massachusetts, in 1774.

art, who sailed from Portsmouth in June, in the Essex frigate; but the vessel being forced by tempestuous weather to go into Lisbon, he took passage in a brig to New York, from whence he came to New London, September 21st. Mr. Stewart was the last collector of his majesty's customs in this port, and continued nominally in office till the declaration of American independence. Dr. Thomas Moffatt was controller of the customs, and esteemed also as a skillful physician, in which line he had some practice. Neither he nor Stewart, though both were subsequently driven from their places by the onward sweep of revolution, were otherwise unpopular, than as Englishmen commissioned by rulers far away, and having no interest in common with the country.¹

After the peace of Paris, in 1763, the trade of New London revived, and prosperity returned in its train. The weekly herald of the town, "the *Summary*," now arose like a phoenix from its ashes, "another and yet the same." It was issued November 3d, 1763, under the auspices of Timothy Green, third of that name in New London, and bore the title of "*New London Gazette*."

An early number of the Gazette gives information that a British squadron had been ordered to cruise on the New England coast, and regulate the colonial trade: the Jamaica was to be stationed near Marblehead; the Squirrel at Newport, and the Cygnet at New London. The Cygnet thus announced, arrived January 11th, 1764, and wintered in the harbor for three successive years. Her commander was Capt. Charles Leslie,² and her officers soon made themselves at home in the town, adding, however, more to the festivity than to the quiet and good order of the place. They attended parties, gave entertainments on ship-board, frequented the taverns, scoured the coun-

1 It has been stated that when Col. Eliphalet Dyer, of Windham, was in England, in 1769, as agent of the Susquehannah and Delaware Company, he was appointed controller of the customs for New London. This was probably a commission to supersede Dr. Moffatt. On his return, the office had become so unpopular that he resigned.

2 Gazette; Capt. Philip Durell, appears to have had the command before the ship left the coast, and to have been the officer best known to the inhabitants. He is said to have erected a flag-staff on Town Hill, where his ensign was always displayed while he was on land. At one time he made an excursion into the country to visit the Mohegans, and presented the sachem, Ben-Uncas, with a flag, which floating on Indian fort hill, could be seen from his ship at the mouth of the river.

try as sportsmen, caught all the trout, and killed all the woodcock within ten miles of the port, and in winter spent much of their time on land, sleighing and merry-making. The attentions paid by the officers to the young females of the place, were not always agreeable to their relatives of the other sex. The more grave and religious citizens would not allow their daughters to attend parties where the brilliant Englishmen were received as guests. Romances have been written, and more might be founded on these scenes, but the moralist frowns upon this period as one in which the early decorum of society and the strict supervision of the laws, had given way to codes of less energy and purity.

One of the officers of the Cygnet married in New London,¹ and in various ways this vessel became associated with the fire-side stories of the inhabitants. A number of the crew deserted, and the quiet woodlands and farm-houses were often searched for the fugitives. It was reported that six of these deserters escaped into the backwoods, and were never recovered. Another is said to have been concealed for a considerable period, or until the rigor of the search was over, in a cave, or rock-cleft of Cedar Swamp. If we may credit tradition, still another of these fugitives lived concealed for many months, and through one long severe winter, in the woods, having for his home and hiding-place, a natural chamber in the rock, something like a cavern, that is found among the cliffs on the western bank of the river, a little south of what is now called the Oneco farm-house. Fearful of being betrayed, he held no communication with any human being until after the departure of the ship; sustaining himself on berries, roots, shell-fish, and what he could furtively obtain by prowling around corn-fields and fruit-trees in the night. When at length he ventured to appear in the presence of his kind, his clothes being nearly worn from his body, and his meager frame exhibiting the likeness of a walking skeleton, people fled from him in superstitious terror.

There is yet another deserter from the Cygnet to be mentioned.²

¹ John Sullivan, purser of the Cygnet, married, February 21st, 1768, Elizabeth, daughter of Gideon Chapman. Their children, Jeremiah C., born August 27th, 1768, at Charleston, S. C., died young; Mary, born November 9th, 1772, in Philadelphia, married Enoch Parsons; Elizabeth, born December 1st, 1778, in Philadelphia, married Dr. S. H. P. Lee.

² These traditional tales may be true in the main points, but it is probable that they ought to be distributed among several war vessels, and not all assigned to the Cygnet. Where tradition is the leader, and there are no dates for landmarks, accuracy can not be expected.

Capt. William Weaver, subsequently a respectable ship-master of New London, is said to have left the Cygnet, the night before she sailed for Europe.¹ The weather was extremely cold, and the ship was anchored three miles from land, but he had resolved to escape from the service or perish in the attempt. After night closed in, he seized an opportunity when he was unobserved, put on a cork jacket, slipped over the side of the ship and made for the shore. He was a good swimmer, but the water was so cold that when he came near to land, and saw a skiff before him fastened to the shore, his benumbed hands refused to grasp the side. He would have perished but for one of those rare coincidences which are sometimes found interwoven with the providential arrangements of the Creator. The owner of the craft, hearing the wind breeze up rather freshly, concluded to go out before retiring for the night, and see if the fastening of his skiff was secure. While examining it he heard a splash in the water, and soon discovered a man making repeated attempts to get hold of the boat, but each time falling back without success. With instinctive humanity he plunged into the water and brought him to the shore.

In town meeting December 27th, 1768, the inhabitants exhibited a commendable zeal to eradicate two distinct evils from their bounds. They first issued an edict against barberry bushes, imposing a fine of fifteen shillings lawful money, upon "every person who finds them growing on their own lands and does not *attempt* to destroy them."² Either this law was but imperfectly enforced, or the barberry perversely resisted the attacks made upon it, for it still continues to be proverbially common in the fields and pastures of the vicinity. Its reputation, however, has brightened by time; the blighting influence attributed to it by our ancestors is now doubted, while its delicate blossoms and bright crimson fruit have won for it a place in ornamental shrubbery.

The second denunciatory vote was directed against an evil of a different kind and less doubtfully pernicious, though it was to be visited with only an equal penalty. This was the mock celebration of Pope-day, which had been for some time annually celebrated on the 5th of

1 The Cygnet left Long Island Sound late in the autumn of 1767.

2 There was also a law of the colony against barberry bushes, allowing persons at certain seasons of the year, to destroy them, wherever they were found. These acts were founded on the prevalent notion that pollen wafted from the flower of the barberry, caused wheat to blast. This idea is now discarded.

November, the anniversary of the Gunpowder plot. The edict was as follows :

“ Whereas the custom that has late years prevailed in this town of carrying about the Pope, in celebration of the 5th of November, has been attended with very bad consequences, and pregnant mischief and much disorder, which therefore to prevent for the future, voted that every person or persons that shall be any way concerned in making or carrying about the same, or shall knowingly suffer the same to be made in their possessions, shall forfeit fifteen shillings to the town treasury of New London, to be recovered by the selectmen of said town, for the use aforesaid.”

Descriptions of this obsolete custom may still be obtained from persons whose memories reach back to a participation in the ceremonies. The boys of the town, apprentices, sailors, and that portion of the inhabitants which come under the denomination of the populace, were the actors. The effigies exhibited were two, one representing the pope and the other the devil; each with a head of hollow pumpkin, cut to represent a frightful visage, with a candle inside to make it “grin horribly a ghastly smile,” and the only difference between the two, consisting in a paper crown upon the head of the pope, and a monstrous pair of horns to designate the other personage. These were fixed upon a platform, and lifted high on the shoulders of a set of bearers, who in the dusk of evening, with boisterous shouts and outcries, marched in procession through the principal streets, stopping at every considerable house to levy pennies and six-pences, or cakes and comfits, upon the occupants. When arrived opposite a door, where they expected largesses, the cavalcade halted, the shouts ceased, and a small bell was rung, while some one of the party mounted the door-step, and sung or recited the customary doggerels, of which the refrain was,

“ Guy Fawkes and the 5th of November,
The Pope and the Gun-powder plot,
Shall never be forgot.”

At the conclusion of the orgies, the two images were thrown into a bonfire and consumed, while the throng danced around with tumultuous shouts.

The ban of authority issued as above related, in December, 1768, against this celebration, had no effect. In defiance of the law, Guy Fawkes and the Pope made their annual procession through the streets, until after the destruction of the town by the British, saving only two or three years in which it was interrupted or greatly modi-

fied, through an unwillingness to give offence to our French allies, who were loyal subjects of the Pope. Washington, in one of his general orders, prohibited the army from making their usual demonstrations on this day, out of respect to the generous power that had come to our aid in the great contest, and the New London boys were too magnanimous in their patriotism not to follow such an example.

After the Revolution, Pope-day or rather Pope-night, revived in all its details, and the restrictive acts of the town being entirely disregarded, Messrs. Shaw and Miller, and other magistrates, determined to try what could be done by indirect measures. Judging that the most effectual method of destroying a custom so ancient and deep-rooted, would be to supersede it with a new one, which not being so firmly established in usage, might be assailed at any time, they suggested to the populace the substitution of Arnold for the Pope, and the 6th of September for the 5th of November. This was eagerly adopted, and the ditty now sung at the doors, ran in this manner :

“ Don’t you remember, the 6th of September,
When Arnold burnt the town,
He took the buildings one by one,
And burnt them to the ground,
And burnt them to the ground.

And here you see these crooked sticks,
For him to stand upon,
And when we take him down from them,
We’ll burn him to the ground,
We’ll burn him to the ground.

Hark ! my little bell goes chink ! chink ! chink !
Give me some money to buy me some drink.
We’ll take him down and cut off his head,
And then we’ll say the traitor is dead,
And burn him to the ground,
And burn him to the ground.”

After a few annual jollifications in this form, the whole custom fell into desuetude.

The commercial prosperity which visited the country after the peace of 1763, was suddenly interrupted by the Stamp Act. As public opinion in Connecticut would not allow the use of stamps, there was a temporary cessation of all kinds of business. The courts were closed, and no clearances could be given at the custom house. The repeal of that odious act caused a general rejoicing, and opened

again the sluices of commerce. But in New London, the privilege of free trade was of short duration. Early in 1769, the revenue sloop, *Liberty*, was stationed, by the commissioners of customs, in the harbor, and every sail that passed out or in, was subjected to a rigorous inspection. Nathaniel Shaw, merchant of New London, writes to one of his correspondents, May 15th, 1769, "The sloop *Liberty* is now stationed here, and searches every vessel in the strictest manner." Again, "Our cruising Pirate sailed yesterday for Newport." This vessel was kept for some time plying between Newport and New London, and overhauling every vessel that she found upon the coast. Before the close of the summer she was destroyed near Newport, in a burst of popular frenzy. The oppression of the laws at this time inevitably led to a laxity of commercial honor. Espionage and imposts on one side were met with secrecy and deception on the other. Goods that could not be cleared might be run, and if sugars and indigo could not afford to pay the customs, they might be shipped as flaxseed, or landed in the silence and shade of midnight, and the duty wholly avoided.¹

The West India trade was accomplished principally in single-decked vessels. It was a cheap and lucrative navigation; lumber, provision and horses were sent away—sugar, rum, molasses and coffee brought back. These statements will apply to other ports in New England, as well as to New London.

The departing vessels carried horses and oxen on deck; staves, boards, shingles and hoops in the hold, and occasionally, but not always, fish, beef, pork and corn. The balance was generally in favour of the American merchant, which being paid in dollars, and bills of exchange furnished him with remittances for England. And this was necessary, for in that quarter the balance was against him; the consumption of British manufactures being double the amount of exports. To Gibraltar, the Spanish ports on the Mediterranean and Barbary—flour, lumber and provender were exported, and mules taken in exchange which were carried to the West Indies and a cargo of the produce of those islands obtained.² The home market

1 "Matters of this kind are daily practised in New York and Boston, for in short, brown sugars will not bear to pay duty on." Shaw's Letter Book, (MS.)

2 Capt. Gabriel Sistera, or Sistare, of Barcelona, Old Spain, was engaged in this line of trade. He came to this country in 1771, bringing his son Gabriel with him, and fixed his residence in New London.

being thus overburdened with the island products, a vent was sought in England. Nathaniel Shaw, Jun., then the most distinguished merchant in New London, entered with spirit into this circle of trade. In May, 1772, he sent the sloop *Dove*, to Great Britain, with brown sugar, molasses, coffee, and *one bag of cotton wool*. These were articles, of which more than enough for home consumption was obtained from the West Indies. In the letter to his correspondents, "Messrs. Lane, Son, and Frazier, merchants in London," respecting this consignment, he says in substance:

"Our trade to the foreign islands, (French and Dutch) has of late increased so much that those articles are not in demand here, which is the occasion of my shipping to your market, and in case it turns to advantage we shall send three or four vessels annually. Send me by return, sheathing, nails, Russia duck, hemp; a large scale beam for weighing hhd. sugar; a good silver watch; a good spy-glass; two dozen white knit thread hose; a piece of kersey and four yards of scarlet cloth, 18s. per yard. I imagine it will be difficult to get a freight back to America in a single deck vessel, and if that should be the case, send a load of salt."

The above is from Shaw's manuscript letter-book.¹ From the same source we gather a few hints respecting the trade with the Spanish ports.

To Peter Vandervoort, New York, Jan. 29th, 1773.

"Get six hundred pounds insurance on the Schooner *Thames* from this port to the Mediterranean to take mules and go to the West Indies and return to New London, on account of Gabriel Sistera & Co., at 6 per cent."

To Messrs. Wharton, Philadelphia, Aug 20th, 1773.

"What premium must I pay on a vessel that sails next week for Gibraltar (with flour) and so to try the markets in the West Indies, and return to New London?"

To Vandervoort, New York, Nov. 9th, 1774.

"What premium must I pay on the Ship *America*, from this to Gibraltar, or (through) the Straights to continue until they find a suitable market?"

To Messrs. Lane, Son & Frazier, London, Dec. 29th, 1774.

"I sent out Capt. Deshon to the Mediterranean with cargo, who was to purchase mules and proceed to the West Indies, there sell for Bills and remit

¹ In the possession of N. S. Perkins, M. D.

you, but he was detained so long at Gibraltar that when he arrived in the West Indies, mules would not sell for cash"¹ &c.

"John Lamb sailed last week in the Ship America for Gibraltar."

Soon after these dates, the onward sweep of the revolution put an end to all traffic with European ports.

¹ About this period Shaw writes to Vandervoort in New York; "Take no more casks from the distillers for unless the times alter we had better do *nothing* than import molasses." Can the distressing state of the times be more forcibly illustrated—Mules would not sell in the West Indies, nor molasses in New England!

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Death of Rev. Eliphalet Adams.—His family and church record.—First Society organized.—Meeting-house struck by lightning.—Settlement of Rev. Mather Byles.—The Rogerene visitation.—Mr. Byles becomes an Episcopalian.—Ministry of Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge.

The ministry of Rev. Eliphalet Adams continued forty-three years and eight months. His last Sabbath service was held Sept. 9th, 1753. Immediately after this he was seized with an epidemic disorder which then prevailed in the town, and expired Oct. 4th. He was interred the next day; the pall-bearers being the two Lyme ministers, (Messrs. Griswold and Johnson,) Rev. Matthew Graves of the Episcopal church, Col. Saltonstall, deacon Timothy Green and Mr. Joshua Hempstead.

“ Eliphalet, son of Rev. William Adams of Dedham, Mass. was born March 26th, 1677; graduated at Harvard, 1694; ordained in New London Feb. 9th, 1708-9; married Dec. 15th, 1709, Lydia daughter of Alexander Pygan.

Children of Rev. Eliphalet and Lydia Adams.

1. William, born Oct. 7th, 1710.	4. Thomas, bap. Jan. 4th, 1715-16.
2. Pygan, “ Mar. 27th, 1712.	5. Samuel, born Aug. 11th, 1717.
3. Mary, “ Mar. 5th, 1713-14.	6. Lydia, “ Feb. 20th, 1720.

“ Mrs. Lydia Adams died Sept. 6th, 1749. Rev. Eliphalet Adams married Elizabeth Wass, of Boston, Sept. 21st, 1751. This second wife survived him. The two youngest children of Mr. Adams died in infancy. William, became a minister; Pygan, a merchant in New London; Mary, married first, Jonathan Gardiner; second, John Bulkley of Colchester; Thomas, became a physician, and settled in East Haddam, but died about a month before his father. The descendants of Rev. Eliphalet Adams in the male line are extinct.”

Between March 17th, 1708-9 and Sept. 9th, 1753, Mr. Adams recorded the baptism of 1,817 children, and 199 adults. Marriages in the same term, 526.

Admissions to the church about 430, of whom not more than a dozen were by letter from other churches. William, the oldest son

of Rev. Eliphalet Adams, graduated at Yale College in 1730, and was two years Tutor in that Institution. He was then licensed to preach and exercised the ministerial office in various parishes for more than sixty years, but was never ordained, and never married. His longest pastoral term, was on Shelter Island. His old age was spent in New London where he died Sept. 25th, 1798, in the eighty-eighth year of his age. It is said that he often congratulated himself on never having been incumbered with wife or parish.

Mr. Adams was the last minister settled by the town. Until the year 1704 one great ecclesiastical Parish extended from Nahantick Bay to Pawkatuck River. People came from Poquetanhock on the north-east and from the borders of Colchester on the north-west, to the meeting at New London.

Groton was made a distinct town in 1704. A second ecclesiastical society was formed in the North Parish in 1722, and Baptist and Episcopal Societies about the year 1726. It was then no longer practicable to transact ecclesiastical business town-wise, and a society was organized which took the denomination of the First Ecclesiastical Society of New London, as belonging to the oldest church. It met Jan. 23d, 1726-7 and chose the following officers :

Christopher Christophers, Moderator.

Christopher Christophers, Jonathan Prentis and John Hempstead, Committee. John Richards, Clerk.

The first acts of this society advert to the different persuasions that had arisen in the town, which made it inconvenient to collect the parish rates, and express a determination to pay the salary of Mr. Adams by free contributions if possible.

In 1738 the subject of a new meeting-house was brought up ; and kept under discussion and in suspense for thirteen years. The old edifice, which we have called the *Saltonstall meeting-house*, was shattered and almost riven asunder by a terrific thunder-bolt which descended upon it August 31st, 1735. Of this awful event particular accounts may be gathered from tradition, from MSS. and from the New England Weekly Journal.

It was Sunday. The morning was fair, and Mr. Adams had his usual service in the meeting-house. In the afternoon, just as the congregation had collected for the second service, a thunder cloud began to gather and soon spread over the heaven. Suddenly it grew dark and as the minister commenced his first prayer, the house was struck with a bolt that shook its foundations, split up several timbers, rafters and posts, scattering them in fragments on every side, and

threw about forty persons senseless on the floor. The terror of the scene cannot be portrayed. The house was filled with the shrieks and cries of those who escaped injury or were but slightly hurt. Many were confused and wounded, and quite a number bereft of sense, but by proper medical aid and great care, all recovered except one. "It pleased God," says Hempstead, "to spare all our lives but Edward Burch a young man, newly for himself, who was struck fatally and died." Among those taken up apparently lifeless were John Prentis, John Plumb, Samuel Green and Jeremiah Chapman, who were in different pews, on the four sides of the house.

The sermon preached by Rev. Eliphalet Adams in reference to this event, the next Lord's Day, Sept. 7th, was printed by Timothy Green.

The meeting-house was left by the thunder-bolt almost a wreck. It was repaired for temporary use, but the society determined to build a new edifice, of larger dimensions and greater elegance, and this might have been soon accomplished had no difficulty arisen in regard to the site. A struggle, or disagreement in regard to position is the usual preliminary to the erection of a church. Was ever a new site chosen without giving rise to controversy and ill feeling? The society not being able to determine the place where a new house of worship should stand, referred the matter to the legislature; who appointed Messrs. Samuel Lynde, John Griswold and Christopher Avery, a committee to repair to New London, hear all parties, and determine the point. These persons met accordingly, and July 4th, 1739, set up a stake on the spot selected by them, viz, "at the south-east corner of the meeting-house green, within thirty rods of the old meeting-house." This appears to have been satisfactory; but the Spanish and French war soon broke forth, and the exposed situation of the town rendered it inexpedient to begin at that time a new and costly edifice. The old house was therefore thoroughly repaired, and ten feet added to each end. The vote was "to cover the whole with cedar clap-boards and cedar shingles; take down the dormerends, repair the belfry; make new window frames and glass the house." A new bell was also procured and hung in 1746. The Saltonstall meeting-house which had been built about forty-five years, with this Adams addition, and its new trimmings, lasted for another term of forty-five years.

Several years elapsed before a successor to Mr. Adams was chosen. The pulpit was occasionally supplied by neighboring ministers and by Mr. William Adams, the son of the last incumbent, but oftener

vacant. We have notices in the Hempstead diary that "Deacon Green carried on"—"many went to the North Parish meeting." "Some went to Lyme"—"No minister provided"—"no minister." "I went to hear the church minister."

Feb. 18th: (1756.) "A society fast on account of our unhappy circumstances: our want of a settled minister."

Feb. 23d. "A society meeting. Mr. (William) Adams negatived, forty-five against forty-two."

May 16th, "Mr. Burr,¹ Rector of the College in the East Jerseys preached all day."

April 10th, (1757.) "Mr. Mather Boiles from Boston preached. A great assembly, three or four times as big as it hath been of late. He stays at Mr. Shaw's."

Rev. Mather Byles, Jr., the person introduced in the last extract, was a son of Rev. Mather Byles, D. D., of Boston, whose mother was a daughter of Increase Mather. His puritan descent, the reputation of his father, and his own brilliant promise secured him popularity in New London before he had earned it. His pulpit services proved to be showy and attractive. He was animated, pertinent, fluent, and interesting. He preached as a candidate for three months, and the people were charmed almost to fascination with his eloquence. July 28th, at a very full meeting, a vote entirely unanimous, invited him to settle: salary £100 per annum, and a gratuity of £240 to be paid in four years. He accepted the call without hesitancy or reservation, and was ordained Nov. 18th, 1757, being then about twenty-three years of age. The sermon on the occasion was preached by Dr. Byles of Boston, father of the candidate, from II. Timothy iii, 17. The charge was given by the same.

Previous to the ordination of Mr. Byles, the following action took place.

"The brethren of the Church met at the Meeting-House Oct. 17th, 1757 and the question being put whether this church would henceforth admit of the Saybrook Platform as a rule of discipline, it was voted in the negative: nemine contradicente." (Ch. Record.)

May 5th, 1758, Captain Pygan Adams, second son of the former minister, was chosen deacon of the church as successor to Timothy Green, who deceased that day; twenty-eight votes were given, of which he received twenty-five. Hempstead writes, Oct. 22d, "Mr.

¹ Father of the celebrated Aaron Burr.

Byles preached in a new pulpit and Capt. Adams officiated as deacon for the first time."

A great source of annoyance during the ministry of the Rev. Mather Byles, was the frequent interruption of the Sabbath service by the Quakers. By this term is understood the followers of John Rogers,¹ of whom for about thirty years after the death of their founder, very little is known. "We were not molested as at first," observes one of their writers, and the reason of this is evident they had refrained from molesting the worship of others. In the year 1764 their former spirit revived, and they began to issue forth, as of old on the Sundays to testify against what they called idolatry. And here commenced a series of provocations on one side and of retaliatory punishment on the other, over which mercy weeps and would fain blot the whole from history. This out-break lasted in its vehemence only a year and a half. John Rogers third, grandson of the founder of the sect, has left a minute account of it in the form of a diary, which was printed with the following title.

"A Looking Glass for the Presbyterians of New London; to see their worship and worshippers weighed in the balance and found wanting. With a true account of what the people called Rogerenes have suffered in that town, from the 10th of June, 1764, to the 13th of December, 1766.

"Who suffered for testifying—

"That it was contrary to Scripture for ministers to preach the Gospel for hire.

"That the first day of the week was no Sabbath by God's appointment—

"That sprinkling infants is no baptism and nothing short of blasphemy, being contrary to the example set us by Christ and his holy apostles—

"That long public prayers in synagogues is forbidden by Christ.

"Also for reproving their Church and minister for their great pride, vain-glory, and friendship of the world which they lived in.

"With a brief discourse in favor of Women's prophecying or teaching in the Church.

"Written by John Rogers of New London.

"Providence, N. E. Printed for the Author. 1767."

From this work extracts will be made and the substance of the narrative given. From no other source can we obtain a statement so full and apparently so accurate, of this remarkable outbreak of enthusiasm and the resistance it encountered.

¹ Benedict gives them the designation of "Rogerene Baptists," as coinciding in their mode of baptism with the Baptist denomination. He calls Rogers "the fantastic leader of a deluded community." Hist. of Bap. Vol. 2, p. 422.

"June 10, 1764. We went to the meeting-house and some of our people went in and sat down; others tarried without and sat upon the ground some distance from the house. And when Mather Byles their priest began to say over his formal synagogue prayer, forbidden by Christ, Mat. 6-5, some of our women began to knit, others to sew, that it might be made manifest they had no fellowship with such unfruitful works of darkness. But Justice Coit and the congregation were much offended at this testimony and fell upon them in the very time of their prayer and pretended divine worship; also they fell upon the rest of our people that were sitting quietly in the house, making no difference between them that transgressed this law and them that transgressed it not; for they drove us all out of the house in a most furious manner; pushing, striking, kicking, &c., so that the meeting was broken up for some time, and the house in great confusion. Moreover they fell upon our friends that were sitting abroad, striking and kicking both men and women, old and young, driving us all to prison in a furious and tumultuous manner, stopping our mouths when we went to speak, chocking us," &c.

Very nearly the same scene was acted over every successive Sunday during that summer. The Quakers were committed to prison, sometimes twenty, sometimes thirty in a day; and if after being released the same person was again committed, his term of imprisonment was doubled. The authorities vainly hoped to weary them out. "But this method," observes John Rogers, "added no peace to them, for some of our friends were always coming out as well as going in, and so always ready to oppose their false worship every first day of the week."

On the 12th of August, the term of commitment by this doubling process had become *four months*; when those within determined to prevent if they could, any farther commitments. Finding that a fresh party of their friends were approaching in charge of the officers, they barred the doors inside and kept the constables at bay.

"Also, we blew a shell in the prison, in defiance of their idol Sabbath, and to mock their false worship, as Elijah mocked the worshippers of Baal. The authority gave orders to break open the prison door, so they went to work and labored exceeding hard on their Sabbath cutting with axes and heaving at the door with iron bars for a considerable time till they were wearied, but could not break open the door."

An entrance into the prison was finally effected from above, and the fresh prisoners let down into the room. Those who had fastened the doors were kept immured till the next November, when they were taken before the county court and fined 40s. and the cost.

These disturbances continued, with some intervals during the severity of winter, until October, 1765, when the magistrates having

proved the inefficacy of detentions and imprisonments, came to the unfortunate determination of having recourse to whippings.

Oct. 15, five were publicly whipped ten stripes each, "at beat of drum." Oct. 23, nine were whipped "at beat of drum." Nov. 4, nine more. Nov. 14, Thanksgiving day, a Rogerene was driven from the meeting house by some young men, ducked in muddy water and then imprisoned.

Nov. 17. "Some of our friends went to town, and an old man aged 73 years cried Repentance! through the streets and as he went, he stopt at the authorities houses and warned them of the danger they were in, if they did not repent of their persecuting God's people."

This party was taken up and confined in the school house till evening, when they were taken out by the populace—and now, for the first time in the history of the town, we find mention made of tar as a mode of punishment. This company were tarred, men and women, but not feathered—warm tar was poured upon their heads and suffered to run down on their clothes and their hats were glued on in this condition. They were otherwise treated with great cruelty by an infuriated mob.

All these sufferings had no influence whatever in putting an end to their testimony, which the next Sunday was renewed with as much spirit as ever, and so continued from week to week. Feb. 2d, 1766, the disturbance was attended by this aggravating circumstance—a woman being turned out of meeting for keeping at her needle work during the prayer, struck several blows against the house, to testify in that way against the mode of worship. Feb 16th. Another heart-rending scene of whipping, tarring, and throwing into the river of men and women, took place. The next Sunday they came again and a great uproar was the consequence, the service being for a considerable time interrupted. They were nineteen in number; ten women and nine men. The women were committed to prison, but the men after being kept in the loft of the court-house till evening, were delivered up to an excited populace, cruelly scourged, and treated with every species of indignity and abuse that the victims of a street mob generally undergo. The women were kept in prison, till the next June "leaving near twenty small children motherless at their homes."

We have now reached the climax of offence and punishment. Both sides from this period relented. The testifiers were less boisterous and aggressive, and they were less severely handled. At times they

would come to the house of worship and commit no other offense than wearing their hats, and this the community at large were disposed to endure, rather than create a disturbance by removing them. But Mr. Byles would never suffer the offensive covering to remain. Seeing the justices at one time unwilling to meddle with the hats and inclined to let them alone as long as the wearers were quiet, he exclaimed with great vehemence.

"I solemnly declare before God and this assembly that as long as I officiate in the priest's office in this house, no man shall sit here with his head covered."

"Now our hats," says the Rogerene, "is such an offense to this proud priest that he will neither preach nor pray when they are in sight."

"The hat he cannot endure, pretending it is contrary to 1 Cor. 11, 4. 'Every man praying or prophesying having his head covered, dishonoreth his head.' Now if this priest would but read the next words, he might see it to be as contrary to scripture for women to pray or prophecy uncovered, yet his meeting is full of young women, with their heads naked, but that gives him no offense at all, it is the fashion so to dress."

Mr. Byles was peculiarly sensitive on the subject of the weekly Rogerene visitation. Other ministers in the neighboring towns took it more quietly, and were therefore less frequently invaded by them. But he would never *argue* nor hold any conversation with them, or even answer when they addressed him, either in street or pulpit. If they appeared on the steps of the meeting-house, he would pause in the services till they were removed, nor would he come out of his house to go to meeting if any of them were in sight. The consequence was that these persevering, cunning people contrived to be ever before him when the hour for worship arrived. Duly as the Sabbath morn returned, they entered the town, and when the bell struck they might be seen, often silent as death, with perchance a quiet smile lurking upon the countenance, two or three sitting by his threshold, a group farther on by the side of the road, waiting to escort him on the way, and others on the door-stone of the meeting-house, or on the horse-block near by, to greet his arrival. Often during his ministry, the people assembled and the bell was kept tolling nearly an hour waiting for the preacher, who was himself waiting for a justice or constable to come and drive away the Quakers, and allow him to go undisturbed to the service. There is no doubt but that his imperial mode of treating the subject aggravated the evil. It was meat and drink to the Quakers to observe how an eye turned upon him, or simply a hat looming up from a church pew, would an-

noy him. They visited the lion on purpose to see him chafe at their presence.

It may not be amiss here expressly to deny the truth of a statement made by Rev. S. Peters, in his pretended *History of Connecticut*—a statement, which though manifestly absurd, is occasionally quoted and obtains a limited currency. In his description of New London, he remarks :

“ The people of this town have the credit of inventing tar and feathers as a proper punishment for heresy. They first inflicted it on Quakers and Anabaptists.”

The invention here ascribed to New London is older than America. It was an ancient English punishment for stealing and other petty felonies, used in the time of the crusades, and probably much earlier. During the Revolution it was in vogue in various parts of New England as a punishment for tories that were particularly obnoxious to the multitude. The two instances mentioned in this chapter, in which it was inflicted upon the Rogerenes, are the only cases that have been found of its use in New London previous to the Revolution. In neither of these instances were feathers used. It was certainly never inflicted here upon the Baptists. The use of tar seems rather to have been suggested as a mode of forcing the offenders to keep on their hats, since they so obstinately persisted in wearing them. It is much to be regretted that a penalty so revolting was ever copied from the code of the mother country.

The visits of the Rogerenes to the churches gradually became less frequent, and less notice was taken of them when they occurred. If they interrupted the worship, or attempted to work in the house, they were usually removed and kept under ward till the service was over, and then dismissed, without fine or punishment. There was nothing stimulating in this course, and they soon relinquished the itinerant mode of testifying. But as a sect they retain their individuality to the present day. They are now to be found in the southeastern part of Ledyard,¹ and though reduced to a few families, vary but little in observances or doctrine, from those inculcated by their founder. In one point of practice, however, there is a remarkable

¹ In 1734 a colony from the Rogerenes of New London, consisting of John Culver and his wife, and ten children with their families, making twenty-one in all, removed to New Jersey, and settled on the west side of Schooley's Mountain in Morris county. It is supposed that the Rogerene principles have become extinct among the descendants of this party. See Benedict, vol. 2, p. 425.

difference: they never interfere with the worship of their neighbors, and are themselves never molested.

In April, 1768, the ministry of the Rev. Mather Byles came to an abrupt termination. Without any previous warning, he assembled a church meeting, declared himself a convert to the ritual of the Church of England, and requested an immediate dismission from them, that he might accept an invitation he had received to become the pastor of an Episcopal church in Boston. This information was received with unqualified amazement, as no rumor or suspicion of any change of sentiment in their minister respecting forms or doctrines, had crept abroad. Mr. Byles laid before them, what he said comprehended the whole statement of the case. First, a letter from the wardens and vestry of the North Church in Boston, dated March 8th, 1768, stating that they had been informed he was inclined to think favorably of their communion, and if such were the case, they wished to engage him for their minister. Second, the reply of Mr. Byles, in which he says,

"Gentlemen, Nothing could give me more surprise than yours of the 8th inst. How you became acquainted with my particular sentiments with regard to the Church of England I am at a loss to determine. But upon the closest and most critical examination, I frankly confess that for several years past I have had, and still have the highest esteem for that venerable church."

In conclusion, he requests them to make their proposals explicit, and they may be assured of a speedy and decisive answer. This was followed, third, by a formal invitation from the wardens and vestry to the rectorship of their church, engaging to give him a salary of £200 *per annum*, to provide him a house and to be at the charge of his removal to Boston and his visit to England to be re-ordained. This last letter had been received that very day. After the reading of these documents, Mr. Byles observed that this summons to Boston was not a thing of his own seeking, or brought about by the influence of his friends, but manifestly a call of Providence inviting him to a greater sphere of usefulness, and plainly pointing out to him the path of duty. The brethren of the church, however, did not view the matter in this light, and a discussion somewhat re-criminative followed.¹ In the course of the debate, Mr. Byles declared that he had no objection to make to their church; he believed

¹ A sketch of this debate was taken down the same evening by a person present, and afterward published.

it to be a true church of our Lord; the churches of Old and New England were equally churches in his view, and he was in perfect charity with all the New England churches, but that he preferred the government, the discipline and the unity of the Church of England. In doctrine he was unchanged, and had not preached a sermon in that house which he should hesitate to preach in the Episcopal church, but his views in regard to the church ritual had changed. He had read many volumes of controversy and had been for three years an Episcopalian in heart.

Upon being further questioned Mr. Byles frankly acknowledged that he had other reasons for leaving, and he even urged that his dismissal was desirable on their own account. Another minister might do much better for them than he had done or could do, for his health was infirm, the position of the church very bleak, the hill wearisome; moreover they desired a minister who would often visit his parishioners and hold lectures here and there, which he could not do—he was not made for a country minister, and his home and friends were all in Boston. He also complained bitterly of the persecutions he had suffered from the Quakers, and the negligence of the authorities in executing the laws against them. They surrounded his house on the Sabbath and insulted him continually, both in and out of the pulpit.

In reply the brethren adverted to his great popularity, the love they had cherished for him, the harmony that had always subsisted between him and his people, and the suddenness and indifference with which he was about to dissolve these ties. Why had not these grievances been mentioned before? When he settled, he was aware of the bleak and tedious hill, he knew that the Quakers were troublesome, that his salary was small, that his friends lived in Boston, yet he had accepted their call and voluntarily brought himself under obligation to walk with them and watch over them.

It is not surprising that in the course of this debate some pointed and harsh remarks should have been made on both sides. The brethren ridiculed their pastor's fear of the Quakers, whom they called a few harmless old women sitting at his gate; alluding to the volumes of controversy which he had read, they observed that they could never before understand how he spent his time, since he so seldom visited his parishioners and preached so many old sermons, and they rather bitterly reminded him of a passage in his father's charge at ordination, relative to studying and watching to promote the welfare of his flock, "that his candle must burn when midnight darkness

covered the windows of the neighborhood"—but now it appeared that instead of watching for the good of souls, he had been studying rites and ceremonies.

This debate was productive of no good; the next day, April 2d, Mr. Byles made his application in due form, requesting "an immediate and honorable dismission," and engaging on his part to refund the £240 which had been given him at settlement—"in case you give me this day such a generous discharge as I have now desired, and put me to no further difficulty." The society record preserves no comments made on the occasion, but simply records that Mr. Byles having requested an immediate dismission and discharge from his contract as their minister—

"Voted, that this Society do fully comply with his request." The church record is equally brief and explicit.

April 12th, 1768. "The Rev. Mr. Mather Byles dismissed himself from the church and congregation."

Mr. Byles hastened his departure from town with a rapidity that almost made it a flight. He conveyed his house¹ to his friend Dr. Moffatt, the English controller of the customs, in pledge for the repayment of the £240 to the society, and ere a Sabbath had returned since his first tender of resignation, he had embarked with his family and all his movables on board of a packet for Newport. He was to have sailed on Saturday, but the vessel was wind-bound and he was obliged to remain over Sunday. He offered to preach a last sermon but his services were declined. He however ascended the wearisome hill, once more, entered the bleak church, and sate silent and dejected, as a listener. In one week a great revulsion of feeling had taken place, and a gulf was opened between him and a people by whom he had been greatly admired and affectionately caressed. He had never been more popular with his congregation than at that moment when his request for a dismission came upon them with the suddenness of an electric shock.

The duration of Mr. Byles' ministry in New London was ten years and a half. During that period he recorded 362 baptisms; 198 marriages, and sixty admissions to the church, of whom eight were by letter.

The change of sentiment in Mr. Byles was soon an affair of notoriety all over New England, and explanations and remarks were

¹ Built by Mr. Byles in 1758 on Main Street at the north corner of Douglas, and now Dr. Bartholomew Baxter's.

published on both sides. At New London, the forsaken congregation displayed the usual buoyant and versatile character of the place; instead of brooding over the matter, they set it up as a mark for the shafts of wit and ridicule. A song was made, embodying the facts, called "The Proselyte," and sung about the town to the tune of the "Thief and Cordelier." They published also a "*Wonderful Dream*," in which the spirit of the venerable Mather was introduced to rebuke his descendant for his apostasy from Puritanism.

Mr. Byles went to England to receive Episcopal ordination and afterward exercised the ministerial function in Boston, till the Revolution. In that trying time he was a royalist and refugee, and one of those prohibited from returning to the state by act of the Massachusetts legislature in September, 1788. He died in St. John's, New Brunswick, where he was rector in March, 1814. The children of Mather and Rebecca Byles, on the record of baptisms, at New London are—Rebecca, Jeremiah and Elizabeth, baptized together in 1762; Mather in 1764; Walter in 1765; Anna and Elizabeth, 1767. The births are not registered.

The successor of Mr. Byles, and seventh minister of the church, was Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge, grandson of the first minister of Groton. The Woodbridge family can boast of a succession of worthy ministers reaching lineally backward to the mother country. First, Rev. John Woodbridge, minister of Stanton in Wiltshire, England. Second, his son Rev. John Woodbridge, first minister of Andover, Mass.; ordained 1645, married Mercy, daughter of Governor Dudley, and died at Newbury, 1695. Third, Rev. John Woodbridge, (son of the preceding,) of Killingworth and Wethersfield, Conn.; dying at the latter place in 1690. Fourth, Rev. John Woodbridge, son of the preceding, first minister of West Springfield, ordained 1698. Fifth, Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge, brother of the last named and first minister of Groton, Connecticut.

In this line the ministerial vocation passes over one generation, and falls upon Ephraim, oldest son of Paul Woodbridge, which Paul was second son of the minister of Groton. This second Ephraim Woodbridge was born in Groton, in 1746, graduated at Yale College 1765, and was ordained in New London, Oct. 11th, 1769. His marriage, with Mary, only surviving daughter of Capt. Nathaniel Shaw, took place, Oct. 26th, fifteen days after his ordination. Seldom have a youthful couple commenced a household under happier auspices. Their residence was on Main Street, in a house built by Capt. Shaw, expressly for his daughter, upon the south end of the Shapley house-

lot, which he had purchased for that purpose.¹ It is probable that the married life and the house-keeping commenced on the same day and that the following inscription still remaining on one of the window panes, was engraved by Mr. Woodbridge on that auspicious morn :

“ *Ephraim Woodbridge*
Hic Vixit.
Hail happy day! the fairest sun that ever rose,
1769.”

These fair promises of life and usefulness were soon overshadowed. Mrs. Mary Woodbridge died of consumption June 10th, 1775, in the twenty-fourth year of her age. Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge died of the same disease, Sept. 6th, 1776, aged thirty years.

“ *Zion may in his fall bemoan*
A Beauty and a Pillar gone.”²

They left two young children, a son and a daughter; precious legacies to the brothers of Mrs. Woodbridge, who had no children of their own.

The ministry of Mr. Woodbridge was less than seven years in duration; the admissions to his church were only twenty-three, of whom six were by letter. In the first four and a half years he received twelve, and baptized seventy-nine. This was in a ratio of not more than one to four, compared with the statistics of Mr. Byles' ministry. But it must here be noticed, that Mr. Woodbridge was the first of the New London ministers who refused to admit persons to the church, upon owning or renewing of their baptismal covenant, nor would he baptize the children of such half-way members. He required a profession of faith; and would allow of no church membership not founded on a change of heart. His congregation soon became divided on these points; very few thoroughly sympathized with the views of their pastor, and he was sustained in his position

1 Now owned by William D. Pratt, in whom it reverts to the Shapley line, he being descended from that family. After the death of Mr. Woodbridge it was purchased by Edward Hallam and has been known as a Hallam house, or the Long Piazza house, but the Piazza having been removed as an encroachment on the street, it has lost this distinctive mark.

2 From the monumental tablet to his memory, where he is called “sixth pastor of the First Congregational Church in New London.” He was more accurately the seventh pastor, and fifth ordained minister. The order of succession is Blinman, Bulkley, Bradstreet, Saltonstall, Adams, Byles, Woodbridge. Bradstreet was the first ordained in the town.

barely by personal popularity and a general indifference in regard to doctrines. Religion was at a low ebb ; there had been no revival in the church since 1741. At the time of Mr. Woodbridge's decease, there were but five male members in his church. After his death the decline was still greater. Posterity will scarcely believe that whilst the old perambulating revivalists were still warm in their graves, their forefathers were reduced to such deadness and ignorance on scriptural subjects. The preaching was formal and infrequent, and conference meetings, prayer meetings and family worship almost wholly unknown. The Episcopal church had very much dwindled ; the Baptist was extinct. And over this sad state of things came the sweeping flood of the Revolution.

CHAPTER XXIX.

The measures of the town relating to the Revolution, sketched in chronological order, from 1767 to 1780.—Early supporters of the Revolution.—Extracts from Shaw's Mercantile Letter Book.—Expedition of Commodore Hopkins.—Departure of the English Collector.

CONNECTICUT, in 1774, contained seventy-two townships, twenty-eight of which were east of Connecticut River, in the counties of New London and Windham. The commerce of the district shows an increase since 1761. It was estimated at seventy-two vessels, three thousand, two hundred and forty-seven tuns, four hundred and six seamen, and twenty sail of coasters, with ninety men.¹ New London had nothing but her commerce; this was her life, her all. In the grand list of 1775, she was rated at £35,528, 17s. 6d., which was less than half the rate of New Haven, and little more than half that of Norwich. Stonington was ahead of her in the value of property. Groton returned a list of £26,902, 6s. 3d.

So copious are the details connected with the Revolution, that may be collected from one source and another, that even after the lapse of more than seventy years, the historian is embarrassed by the affluence of materials. He is in danger of losing the thread of his narrative in the labyrinth of interesting incidents presented to him. In the present case, however, there can be no doubt but that it will be proper to notice first what was done by the town in its corporate capacity. This will not require a long article. The records are meager. The Revolution, as it regards New London, was achieved by

¹ Jeremiah Miller, of New London. Answer to queries, Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d series, vol. 2, p. 219.

public spirit and voluntary action, rather than by organization and law. From the town records we learn but little of the contest in which the inhabitants were such great sufferers.

A letter from the selectmen of Boston inclosing the famous resolutions of October 23d, 1767, was laid before the town Dec. 28th, and the subject referred to a committee of fifteen of the inhabitants, viz.

Gurdon Saltonstall,	Nathaniel Shaw, Jun.,
Daniel Coit,	Ezekiel Fox,
William Hillhouse,	Samuel Belden,
Richard Law,	Winthrop Saltonstall,
Jeremiah Miller,	Guy Richards,
Joseph Coit,	Russell Hubbard,
James Mumford,	Titus Hurlbut.
Nathaniel Shaw,	

This committee entered fully into the spirit of the Boston resolutions, and drew up a form of subscription to circulate among the inhabitants, by which the use of certain enumerated articles of European merchandise was condemned and relinquished. These articles appear to have been generally adopted, and faithfully kept.

In December, 1770, the town appointed four delegates to the grand convention of the colony, held at New Haven :

Gurdon Saltonstall,	Nathaniel Shaw, Jun.,
William Hillhouse,	William Manwaring.

We find no further record of any action of the town relative to the political discontent of the country, until the memorable month of June, 1774, when the edict of Parliament, shutting up the port of Boston, took effect, and roused the colonies at once to activity. Votes and resolutions expressive of indignation, remonstrance and sympathy, were echoed from town to town, and pledges exchanged to stand by each other, and to adhere with constancy to the cause of liberty. The town meeting at Groton, was on the 20th of June, William Williams, moderator. The committee of correspondence chosen, consisted of seven prominent inhabitants:

William Ledyard,	Charles Eldridge, Jun.,
Thomas Mumford,	Deacon John Hurlbut,
Benadam Gallup,	Amos Geer.
Amos Prentice,	

The meeting at New London was on the 27th; Richard Law, moderator, and the committee five in number:

Richard Law,
Gurdon Saltonstall,
Nathaniel Shaw, Jun.,

Samuel H. Parsons,
Guy Richards.

The declarations and resolves issued by these meetings were similar to those of hundreds of towns at that juncture. In December, the town added two other members to the committee of correspondence, viz., John Deshon and William Coit. At this time also, a committee of inspection was appointed, consisting of thirty persons, who had instructions "to take effectual care that the acts of the Continental Congress, held at Philadelphia, September 5th, 1774, be absolutely and bona fide adhered to." Any seven of the members were to form a quorum, and in cases of emergency the whole were to be called together at the court-house. From this period almost all action relating to the contest with England was performed by committees, or by spontaneous combination among the citizens, or by colonial and military authority, and the results were not recorded.

Committee of Correspondence for the year 1776.

Gurdon Saltonstall,
Nathaniel Shaw, Jun.,
Marvin Wait,

John Deshon,
John Hertell,
William Hillhouse.

January 15th, 1776. "Voted, that if any person within the limits of this town shall at any time between now and the 1st of January next, unnecessarily expend any gunpowder by firing at game or otherwise, shall for every musket charge forfeit and pay the sum of twenty shillings lawful money into the town treasury."

March 31st, 1777. A committee of supply was appointed to provide necessaries for the families of such soldiers as should enlist in the continental battalions then raising in the state. This was in compliance with the orders of the governor and council of safety, and a committee for this purpose was annually chosen till the conclusion of the war. The selectmen and informing officers were enjoined to search out and punish all violations of the law regulating the prices of the necessities of life.

At the same meeting the town-clerk was directed to remove the books and files of the town to some place of safety, reserving only in his own custody those required for immediate use.

In conformity with this vote the town records were removed into the western part of the township, now Waterford, and committed to the charge of Mr. George Douglass, by whom they were kept at his homestead until after the termination of the war. By this wise precaution, they escaped the destruction which swept away a portion of

the probate records, and probably all those of the custom-house, on the 6th of September, 1781.

June 23d, 1777. "Voted almost unanimously to admit of inoculation for small pox, agreeably to a resolve of the General Assembly in May last."

The committee of correspondence for the years 1777 and 1778, consisted of three persons only, the first three named on the list of 1776. The committee of inspection was reduced to nineteen, and in January, 1779, it was entirely dropped.

The articles of confederation agreed upon by Congress in 1777, and referred to the several states for consideration, were in Connecticut ultimately presented to the inhabitants in their town meetings, for decision. The vote of New London was as follows:

December 29th, 1777. "Gurdon Saltonstall, moderator. Voted in a very full town meeting, nem con, that this town do approve of and acquiesce in the late proposals of the honorable Continental Congress, entitled 'Articles of Confederation and perpetual union between the United States of America,' as being the most effectual measures whereby the freedom of said states may be secured and their independency established on a solid and permanent basis."

In October, 1779, a state convention was held at Hartford; the deputies from New London, were Gurdon Saltonstall and Jonathan Latimer.

From year to year as the war continued, the population decreased, estates diminished, and the burdens of the town grew heavier. The difficulty of furnishing the proper quota of men and provisions for the army, annually increased. Large taxes were laid, large bounties offered for soldiers to serve during the war, and various ways and means suggested and tried to obtain men, money, clothing, provisions, and fire-arms, to keep the town up to the proportion required by the legislature. Much of the town action was absorbed by this necessary but most laborious duty.

June 27th, 1780. A bounty of £12 *per annum*, over and above the public bounty, was offered in hard money, to each soldier that would enlist to serve during the war; £9 to each that would enlist for three years; and £6 to each that would enlist to serve till the 1st day of January next.

In December, 1780, a committee was appointed to collect all the fire-arms belonging to the inhabitants, and deposit them in a safe place, for the benefit of the town. Only extreme necessity could justify an act so arbitrary.

So many of the inhabitants of New London had been trained as fishermen, coasters and mariners, that no one is surprised to find them, when the trying time came, bold, hardy and daring in the cause of freedom. In all the southern towns of the county, Stonington, Groton, New London, Lyme, the common mass of the people were an adventurous class, and exploits of stratagem, strength and valor by land and sea, performed during the war of independence, by persons nurtured on this coast, might still be recovered, sufficient to form a volume of picturesque adventure and exciting interest. At the same time, many individuals in this part of the country, and some too of high respectability, took a different view of the great political question, and sided with the parliament and the king. In various instances, families were divided; members of the same fireside adopted opposite opinions, and became as strangers to each other; nor was it an unknown misery for parents to have children ranged on different sides on the battle field. At one time a gallant young officer of the army, on his return from the camp, where he had signalized himself by his bravery, was escorted to his home by a grateful populace, that surrounded the house and filled the air with their applaudive huzzas; while at the same time, his half-brother, the son of the mother who clasped him to her bosom, stigmatized as a tory, convicted of trade with the enemy, and threatened with the wooden horse, lay concealed amid the hay of the barn, where he was fed by stealth for many days. This anecdote is but an example of many that might be told, of a similar character.

It would be of no service now to draw out of oblivion the names of individuals who at various times during the eight years of darkness and conflict, were suspected of being inimical to the liberties of their country. Many of these changed their sentiments and came over to the side of independence, and all at last acquiesced in their own happiness and good fortune, growing out of the emancipation of their country from a foreign scepter. It is an easier as well as more pleasing task to mention names that on account of voluntary activity, sacrifice of personal interest, and deeds of valorous enterprise, exerted for the rights of man, lie prominent upon the surface, illuminating the whole period by their brightness.

Those who came earliest forth in the cause demand our especial admiration, since it is emphatically true that they set their lives at stake. In a civil capacity the early names of note and influence were those of Deshon, Law, Hillhouse, Mumford and Shaw.

Capt. John Deshon served as an agent in erecting the fortifications

at New London, and as commissary in various enlistments of troops. This was under the authority of the governor. In July, 1777, Congress appointed him one of the naval board of the eastern department.¹

Richard Law² and William Hillhouse were members of the governor's council, and each carried a whole heart into the Revolution. Hillhouse was also major of the second regiment of horse raised in the state.³ Law had been nominated as a member of Congress, but in June, 1776, just at the critical period of appointment, he was confined in a hospital with the small-pox. His name was thus deprived of the honor of being affixed to the Declaration of Independence. In October, 1776, he was elected to Congress, and excused from further service in the council.

Thomas Mumford, of Groton, belonged to that company of gentlemen, eleven in number, who in April, 1775, formed the project of taking Ticonderoga. This undertaking, so eminently successful, was wholly concerted in Connecticut, without any authority from Congress. The company obtained the money requisite (£810,) from the colonial treasury, but gave their individual notes and receipts for it. The Assembly, in May, 1777, canceled the notes and charged the amount to the general government.⁴ In 1778, Mumford was one of a committee appointed to receive and sign emissions of bills, and also an agent of the secret committee of Congress.⁵

1 Council records in Hinman's War of the Revolution, p. 466. John Deshon was of French Huguenot extraction. His father, Daniel Deshon, was a youth in the family of Capt. René Grignon, at the time of the decease of the latter, at Norwich, in 1716, and is mentioned in his will. After the death of his patron, he settled in New London, where he married Ruth Christophers, and had several sons, and one daughter who married Joseph Chew. He died in 1781, at the age of eighty-four, which carries his birth back to 1697. Three of his sons were conspicuous in the Revolutionary War. Capt. Daniel Deshon was appointed in 1777, to the command of the armed brig "Old Defence," owned by the state, which was unfortunately taken by the British, in January, 1778. John, mentioned in the text, was the second son, and born December 26th, 1727. Richard, another son, served in the army. The name is supposed to have been originally Deschamps.

2 Son of Governor Jonathan Law, and born in Milford, March 17th, 1732-3. He was, after the Revolution, judge of the district of Connecticut, and chief justice of the superior court. The late Capt. Richard Law, and Hon. Lyman Law, M. C., were his sons.

3 Major Hillhouse was subsequently for many years chief judge of the county court. Tradition confirms the truth of the character engraved upon his monument:

"A judge and statesman; honest, just and wise."

4 State Records, Hinman, p. 31.

5 Ibid, p. 497.

Nathaniel Shaw, Jun., has been mentioned in a former chapter, as an enterprising merchant; we may add that he performed important service to the country during the Revolution, particularly in naval affairs. His judgment in that department was esteemed paramount to all others in the colony. He also acted as a general agent, or friend of the country, in various concerns, military and fiscal, as well as naval. His mercantile letters, though brief, and devoted to matters of business, contain allusions to passing events that are valuable as cotemporaneous authority. They have been already quoted, and further extracts will occasionally be made.

To P. Vandervoort, October 22d, 1773.

“In regard to the tea that is expected from England, I pray heartily that the colonies may not suffer any to be landed. The people with us are determined not to purchase any that comes in that way.”

We have here a hint that apprises us of the spirit of the inhabitants of New London, in regard to the duty on tea. Aged people have related that some salesmen who had no scruples on the subject, having received small consignments of custom-house tea, as experiments to try the market and tempt the people to become purchasers, were either persuaded or compelled to make a bonfire of it upon the Parade; and that not only the tea-chests from the shops were emptied, but some enthusiastic housekeepers added to the blaze by throwing in their private stores. It is further related that parties were made, and weddings celebrated, at which all ribbons, artificial flowers, and other fabrics of British manufacture, were discarded, and *Labrador tea*¹ introduced.

Shaw to Vandervoort, April 1st, 1775.

“Matters seem to draw near where the longest sword must decide the controversy. Our Gen. Assembly sets to-morrow and I pray God Almighty to direct them to adopt such measures as will be for the interest of America.”

To Messrs. Wharton, Philadelphia, May 5th.

“I wrote to you by Col. Dyer and Mr. Dean, our colony delegates to congress, desiring you to let them have what money they should have occasion for to the amount of 4 or 500 pounds. I really do not know what plan to follow or what to do with my vessels”

To the Selectmen of Boston, May 8th.

“I have received from Peter Curtenius, treas^r of the com^{ee} in New York,

¹ This was probably the *Ceanothus Americanus*, a plant sometimes used during the Revolution as a substitute for tea, and usually called *Jersey tea*.

100 bbls. of flour for the poor in Boston. He writes me he shall forward £350 in cash for the same use."

To Capt. Handy, May 31st.

"I never met with so much difficulty to get hard money since I was in trade, as within these two months past. I have large quantities of West India goods in store, in Boston, in New York, and in Phil^a, but cannot raise a shilling."

If such difficulties as are here described, were experienced by men of large resources, it may easily be imagined that all the smaller mercantile concerns must have been harassed and impoverished to the last extremity. The stagnation of business was general. Neither cash nor merchantable bills could be obtained. The most lamentable destitution prevailed; every thing was wanted, yet no one had the means to buy.

To Messrs. Thomas and Isaac Wharton, September 18th, 1775.

"I shall set out to-morrow for the camp at Roxbury, and it is more than probable that I may come to Philadelphia on my return, and hope I shall be able to procure Adams' Letters, which I have never seen."

To an agent in Dominica, January 16th, 1776.

"All our trade is now at an end and God knows whether we shall ever be in a situation to carry it on again. No business now but preparations for war, ravaging villages, burning towns," &c.

At a very early period of the contest, Mr. Shaw took the precaution to secure supplies of powder from the French islands. In December, 1774, he had represented to the government of the colony, the great destitution of New London, and other exposed places in this respect, and urged them to send without delay to the West Indies for a considerable stock, offering a fast sailing vessel of his own, to be used for this end. The Assembly acted on this advice, sending him an order to obtain six hundred half barrels, with all possible speed. In July, 1775, to the commander of a sloop fitted out with flour and pipe-staves for Hispaniola, he gave the brief direction: "Purchase gunpowder and return soon." Again, in January, 1776, he writes to William Constant, his agent in Guadaloupe, requesting him to purchase powder "to the amount of all the interest you have of mine in your hands." And adds, "make all the despatch you can; we shall want it very soon." We learn from his accounts, that in 1775, he furnished the regiment of Col. Parsons with powder, ball and flints, and that in June, 1776, at the order of the governor, he forwarded an opportune supply of powder to General Washington.

July 22d, he wrote himself to the commander-in-chief, stating that he had recently forwarded to him three cases of arms and a quantity of flints, adding, "and now, by the bearer, John Keeny, I have sent two cases of arms, and one chest and bar of continental arms and cutlasses, as per invoice." July 31st, he advises Robert Morris, chairman of the secret committee of Congress, that he has received another supply of powder, "13,500 cwt., arrived from Port-au-Prince and safe landed."

The first naval expedition under the authority of Congress was fitted out at New London in January, 1776. The command was given to Commodore Hopkins—sometimes styled admiral. The fleet consisted of four vessels, the Alfred, Columbus, Andrea Doria and Cabot, varying in armament from fourteen to thirty-six guns.¹ The preparations were made with great expedition and secrecy, no notice being given respecting it in any of the newspapers. It was destined to cruise at the south, and annoy the British fleet in that quarter. Dudley Saltonstall, previously in command of the fort, or battery, on the Parade, was appointed senior captain; Elisha Hinman a lieutenant; Peter Richards and Charles Bulkley, enterprising young seamen of the place, were among the midshipmen—eighty of the crew were from the town and neighborhood. The fleet sailed about the first of February to its rendezvous in Delaware Bay—less than a month from the time in which the first preparations were commenced. The only results of this expedition, from which apparently some great but indefinite advantage was expected, were the plunder of the British post of New Providence, and a fruitless combat with the British ship Glasgow, on their homeward voyage, near the eastern end of Long Island.

The commodore re-entered New London harbor on the 8th of April;² he had taken seventy prisoners, eighty-eight pieces of cannon, and a large quantity of military and naval stores. Many of the heavy pieces of ordnance had arrived previously, in a sloop commanded by Capt. Hinman.

Just at the period of the return of this fleet, the American army was on its way from Boston to New York.³ Gen. Washington met Commodore Hopkins at New London, April 9th. The brigade under

1 Cooper's Naval History.

2 New London Gazette.

3 Sparks' Life of Washington.

Gen. Greene was then here, ready to embark in transports. Washington slept that night at the house of Nathaniel Shaw.¹

Commodore Hopkins, immediately after his return, formed a plan for the capture of the Rose man-of-war, commanded by Sir James Wallace, then cruising upon the coast. Gen. Washington consented to furnish two hundred men to assist the enterprise, and the governor and council ordered the Defence and the Spy to join the squadron for the cruise.² Thus reinforced, the commodore sailed to the eastward; but his plans were not accomplished. Neither the details of the project, nor the cause of its failure, are now understood. The disappointed fleet went into port at Providence.

A large number of seamen belonging to the fleet, was left behind in New London, sick, and in the charge of Mr. Shaw. To him also was confided the care of the stores that had been disembarked.

Mr. Shaw to Governor Trumbull, April 25th.

"Inclosed is an invoice of the weight and size of thirty-four cannon received from Admiral Hopkins, ten of which are landed at Groton, viz. three twenty-four-pounders, two eighteen, and five twelve. The remainder are at New London. He has landed a great quantity of cannon ball. The mortars and shells General Washington desired might be sent to New York, and the Admiral has sent them. The remainder of the cannon are part sent to Newport, and part are on board the fleet, which he wants to carry to Newport. The nine-pounders are but ordinary guns, the others are all very good."

To Francis Lewis, Esq., at Philadelphia, June 19th.

"I have received a letter from Commodore Hopkins, wherein he says that I was appointed by Congress as their agent for this port. I should be glad to have directions how to proceed. I am in advance at least a thousand pounds for supplies to the fleet and hospital in this town; one hundred and twenty men were landed sick and wounded, twenty of which are since dead; the remainder have all since joined the fleet at Providence."

To Hon. John Hancock, President of Congress, July 31st.

"The cannon and stores delivered me by Commodore Hopkins, amount to £4,765, 4s. 10d. L. M.

Last Sunday, a ship sent in as a prize by Capt. Biddle, in the Andrew Doria, ran on the rocks near Fisher's Island, being chased by a British ship-of-war, and immediately a number of armed men from Stonington went on board, and as they say, prevented the man-of-war from destroying her. The next day,

1 The chamber in which he reposed, has been retained of the same size and finish, and even the furniture has been but little varied since. When La Fayette visited New London, in 1824, being shown into this room, he knelt reverently by the side of the bed, and remained a few minutes in silent prayer.

2 Hinman, p. 356.

Capt. Hinman, in the Cabot, went to their assistance, and has saved and brought into port ninety hogsheads of rum, and seven of sugar; remainder of the cargo is lost. The Cabot has been lying here ever since Commodore Hopkins set out for Philadelphia, with a fine brave crew, waiting for orders."

July 10th, 1776, Nathaniel Shaw, Jr., was appointed by the governor and council of safety, "agent of the colony for naval supplies and taking care of sick seamen." From this period during the remainder of the struggle, as an accredited agent of Congress and the colony, he furnished stores, negotiated the exchange of prisoners, provided for sick seamen, and exercised a general care for the public service in his native town. He was also engaged on his own account, as were also other prominent citizens of the place, in sending out private armed vessels to cruise against the enemy. These for a time met with a success which stimulated the owners to larger adventures, but in the end, three-fourths, and perhaps a larger proportion of all the private cruisers owned in New London were captured and lost.

At the May session of the Legislature in 1776, the governor was placed at the head of the naval and custom-house business of the colony, with power to appoint subordinate naval officers for the ports of New Haven, New London, Middletown and Norwalk. Duncan Stewart, the English collector, was still in New London, where he dwelt without other restraint than being forbidden to leave town, except by permission from the governor. That permission appears to have been granted whenever solicited. In 1776, he spent three months in New York upon parole, and in June, 1777, obtained leave to remove thither with his family and effects, preparatory to taking passage for England, to which country the governor granted him a passport. Permission was also given him at first to take with him the goods of Dr. Moffatt, late his majesty's controller of customs, but this was countermanded, representations having been made to the governor, that Dr. Moffatt had withdrawn from America in a hostile spirit, and had since been in arms against her. His goods, which consisted only of some household stuff of trifling value, were therefore confiscated.

The populace took umbrage at the courtesies extended to the English collector. At one time, when some English goods were brought from New York for the use of his family, the mob at first would not permit them to be landed, and afterward seized and made a bonfire of them. The ringleaders in this outrage, were arrested and lodged in jail; the jail-doors were broken down and they were released; nor were the authorities in sufficient force to attempt a re-commit-

ment. It was indeed a stirring season, and the restraints of law and order were weak as flax. It is however gratifying to know that Mr. Stewart was allowed to leave the place with his family, without any demonstration of personal disrespect.¹ He departed in July, 1777.

[*Note on the Shaw Family.* The elder Nathaniel Shaw was not a native of New London, but born in Fairfield, Ct., in 1703, to which place it is said, his father had removed from Boston. He came to New London before 1730, and was for many years a sea-captain in the Irish trade, which was then pursued to advantage. He had a brother, who sailed with him in his early voyages, but died on a return passage from Ireland, in 1732. Capt. Shaw married in 1730, Temperance Harris, a granddaughter of the first Gabriel Harris of New London, and had a family of six sons and two daughters. Three of the sons perished at sea, at different periods, aged twenty, twenty-one and twenty-two; a degree of calamity beyond the common share of disaster, even in this community, where so many families have been bereaved by the sea. The other sons lived to middle age. Sarah, the oldest child, married David Allen, and died at the age of twenty-five. Mary, the youngest, has already been mentioned as the wife of the Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge; though dying at the age of twenty-four, she was the only one of Capt. Shaw's family who left descendants. The parents lived to old age. Capt. Shaw died in 1778; his relict in 1796.

Nathaniel Shaw, 2d, was the oldest son, and born Dec. 5th, 1735. He lived through the dark days of the Revolution, always active and enterprising, but was suddenly cut off by the accidental discharge of his own fowling-piece, before the nation had received the seal of peace, April 15th, 1782. His wife preceded him to the grave; she died Dec. 11th, 1781, of a malignant fever taken from some released prisoners, to whose necessities she ministered.]

1 Duncan Stewart, Esq., married in Boston, Jan. 6th, 1767, Nancy, youngest daughter of John Erving, Esq. They had three children born in New London—a daughter that died in infancy, as we learn from a small gravestone in the old burial-ground, and two sons that went to England with their parents in 1777. Mr. Stewart's residence, with the adjoining custom-house, stood near the Cove, on Main Street; both were destroyed Sept 6th, 1781. The site is now covered by the manufacturing establishment of Messrs. Albertson and Douglas.

CHAPTER XXX.

MILITARY AFFAIRS.

The Militia.—Two companies from New London at Bunker Hill.—Nathan Hale.—Tories.—Cannonade of Stonington.—Fortification.—Building of Fort Trumbull.—Officers on duty.—Enlistments.—Marauders.—Smugglers.—Shaving-mills.—Various alarms.—British fleets in the Sound.—Exchange of prisoners.—Rumors and alarms of 1779 and 1780.—Notices of individual soldiers.

EARLY in the year 1775, an independent military company was formed in New London, under Capt. William Coit. It was well-trained and equipped, and held itself ready for any emergency. Immediately after the news of the skirmish at Lexington was received, this gallant band started for the scene of conflict. They encamped the first night on Norwich Green; the second, on Sterling Hill, and the third in Providence. Another militia company went from those parts of the town which are now Waterford and Montville, under Major Jonathan Latimer; Capt. Abel Spicer with another from Groton. Fifty towns in Connecticut sent troops to Boston on this occasion. In May, the General Assembly ordered remuneration to be made from the colonial treasury for expenses incurred in the Lexington alarm, and the quota of New London was £251, 18s. 6d. This amount is the fifth highest on the list. Windham stands first; Woodstock, from whence Capt. Samuel McLellan turned out with forty-five mounted men is next; then Lebanon, Suffield, New London.¹

Under the old organization, the militia of New London belonged to the third Connecticut regiment, and in 1774, the field-officers of this regiment were Gurdon Saltonstall, of New London, colonel; Jabez Huntington, of Norwich, lieut. colonel, and Samuel H. Parsons, major. Major Parsons was of Lyme, but at that time residing

in New London, in the practice of the law, being king's attorney for New London county. In April, 1775, six new regiments were formed, and the promotions after this period were so rapid, that it is difficult to keep pace with the grade of the officers. Every new requisition for volunteers, was followed by changes among the commissioned officers, and generally by an advance in rank.

In June, one of the six newly raised regiments, under the command of Col. Parsons, was reviewed in New London. This is believed to have been the first regimental training in this state, east of Connecticut River. Two companies of this regiment, the fourth and fifth, were raised in New London, and of these William Coit and James Chapman—names which by their townsmen were considered synonymous with patriotism and hardy gallantry, were captains.¹

These two companies marched immediately to Boston, and took part in the battle of Bunker Hill.² Of Capt. Coit's company, Jeddiah Hide was first lieutenant, James Day second lieutenant, William Adams ensign. Of Capt. Chapman's company, the corresponding officers were Christopher Darrow, John Raymond and George Lattimer. Capt. Coit, soon after the battle, entered into the navy, and was appointed, by Congress, to the command of the schooner *Harrison*, fitted out in Boston Bay, to cruise against the enemy.³

1 State Records, (Hinman,) p. 169.

2 The following minutes of the day before the battle, were copied from the originals preserved in the sergeant's family, by the late Thomas Shaw Perkins. They are inserted here as memorials of one of the New London companies that fought at Bunker's Hill.

“ Sergeant Fargo's report to the Sergeant Major of Capt. Coit's company—4th company, in 6th regiment, under Col. Parsons of the Connecticut line.

“ June 16, 1775. Morning Report.

“ Main guard 18. Barrack Guard 7. Sick 9. Servants 4. Present 68. Total 106. Signed, Moses Fargo. Orderly Sergeant.

“ General Orders, June 16, 1776.

“ Parole, *Lebanon*; Countersign, *Coentry*.

“ Field Officer of the day, Col. Nixon.

“ Field Officer of the Picquet, Major Brooks.

“ Field Officer of the Main-Guard, Lt. Col. Hutchinson.

“ Adjutant to-morrow, Holden.

“ Draft Capt. Coit's company—one subaltern, nine privates for the picquet guard; one sergeant and seven privates for the advance guard to-night. Sergeant Edward Hallam is detailed to this service.”

3 Frothingham's Siege of Boston, p. 260. Capt. Coit, claimed to be “the first man in the states who turned his majesty's bunting upside down.” This was a current belief at the time, and has been preserved by tradition, but its correctness at this distance of time can not be determined. The *Harrison* was certainly one of the first vessels commissioned by Congress, and may have been the first to take a prize.

In July, two more regiments were raised in Connecticut, under Col. Charles Webb, and Col. Jedediah Huntington. Of Webb's regiment, Jonathan Latimer, Jr., was major and captain of the third company, having for his first lieutenant, Nathan Hale,¹ who at the time of receiving his commission, sustained the office of preceptor of the Union Grammar School, in New London.

It has been frequently asserted that when the news of the battle at Lexington arrived in town, Nathan Hale immediately dismissed his scholars, harangued the citizens, and marching for Boston with the company of Capt. Coit, took part in the battle of Bunker Hill. This statement is not entirely accurate; his proceedings were marked with more calmness and maturity of judgment. He had taken an active part in all the patriotic measures of the inhabitants, but not till he had been tendered a commission in the army, which was subsequent to the battle of Bunker Hill, did he decide to relinquish his office of preceptor before the expiration of the time for which he was engaged. His letter to the proprietors of the school, announcing his purpose, was dated Friday, July 17th, 1775. In this communication, he observes, that the year for which he had engaged would expire in a fortnight; but as he had received information that *a place was allotted to him in the army*, he asked as a favor to be excused immediately. Before the close of July, the regiments of Webb and Huntington were ordered to Boston, where they were placed under the commander-in-chief. Lieutenant Hale shortly afterward received a captain's commission.

Those who knew Capt. Hale in New London, have described him as a man of many agreeable qualities; frank and independent in his bearing; social, animated, ardent; a lover of the society of ladies, and a favorite among them. Many a fair cheek was wet with bitter tears, and gentle voices uttered deep execrations on his barbarous foes, when tidings of his untimely fate were received.

As a teacher, Capt. Hale is said to have been a firm disciplinarian, but happy in his mode of conveying instruction, and highly respected by his pupils. The parting scene made a strong impression on their minds. He addressed them in a style almost parental; gave them earnest counsel, prayed with them, and shaking each by the hand, bade them individually farewell.

The summer of 1776 was noted for the large number of arrests of persons charged with toryism. Many of these were brought to New

London, and from thence sent into the interior of the state, to keep them from intercourse with the enemy. In August, three vessels arrived in one week, with persons arrested on Long Island and in New York city. After a short confinement in the jail, they were forwarded to Norwich and Windham, for safe keeping. Green's newspaper sometimes announced them as "gangs of miscreants," and again as "gentlemen tories." In the interior towns, they were allowed to go at large, within certain limits, and most of them after a few months were permitted to return to their homes.

On the 25th of July, three British ships of war came athwart New London harbor and anchored: these were the *Rose*, commanded by Capt. Wallace; the *Swan*, and the *King-fisher*. This was a virtual blockade, and created much alarm. The town had no defense except the spirit of her inhabitants. The sole strength of the fort was its garrison, which consisted mostly of captains and mates of vessels that lay unemployed at the wharves. No other commander on this coast acquired a renown so odious as Capt. Wallace. He was the terror of the small ports and small vessels, capturing and plundering without discrimination, and threatening various points with attack. On the 30th of August, he verified his threats by a cannonade of the thriving village of Stonington, Long-point. On this exposed peninsula, about half a mile in length, formerly a moiety of the Chesebrough farm, a hardy company of mariners and artisans had clustered together, and acquired a creditable share of the trade of the Sound. The tender of the *Rose*, whose business it was to destroy every thing in the shape of keel or sail that came in its way, pursued one of its victims to the wharf of the village. The citizens eagerly collected for its defense. Capt. Benjamin Pendleton, and other brave and true men were there, and the tender was soon driven from its prey. But the *Rose* came up, and without summons or communication of any kind, opened her broadside upon the village. She continued firing at intervals for several hours, until the pursued vessel was cut out and conveyed away. Only sound shot were used, and therefore no houses took fire, though several were much shattered by the balls. One man was wounded but none killed.¹

¹ At the October session of the legislature, 1775, the sum of £12, 4s. 4d. was allowed to Jonathan Weaver, Jun., a music man in the company of Capt. Oliver Smith, who was dangerously wounded at Stonington, Long-point. Hinman, p. 192.

It is singular that when Stonington was again cannonaded by the British, August 9th, 1814, the result should have been so nearly the same; buildings damaged, one man severely wounded, no one killed.

On the 5th and 6th of August, 1775, a fleet of nine ships and several smaller vessels, gathered around New London Harbor, and appeared as if about to enter. Expresses were sent forth to alarm the country, but it was soon ascertained that the object of the fleet was to secure the stock that was owned upon the fertile islands of the Sound. From Fisher's Island alone they took 1,100 sheep, beside cattle and other provisions; for which they made a reasonable compensation to Mr. Brown, the lessee of the island; but from Gardiner's and Plum Islands, they took what they wanted without payment.

This incident probably operated as a spur upon the higher powers of the colony, in regard to a subject much discussed in their councils, viz., the fortification of New London.

Among the heads of inquiry¹ proposed by his majesty's secretary of state to the colony of Connecticut, in 1773, was this:

"What forts and places of defense are there within your government, and in what condition?"

To which Governor Trumbull replied, October, 1774:

"A small battery at New London, consisting of nine guns, built and supported at the colony's expense."

This was then the only fortification in Connecticut when the war commenced. But the defense of the coast was a subject to which the attention of the legislature was soon called.

April, 1775, a committee was appointed to examine the points of defense, and report on the best means of securing the country from invasion. Of this committee, Messrs. G. Saltonstall, D. Deshon and T. Mumford, reported in regard to New London, that the battery was in a ruinous condition, and that the only effective cannon in the place consisted of six new pieces; (four eighteens and two twelves.) They proposed that three positions, Mamacock, Winthrop's Neck and Groton Height, should be fortified, and that fourteen new cannon (twenty-four) should be procured.² This judicious advice was not adopted, probably on account of a void in the treasury. All that was obtained at this time, was an order to repair and complete the old fort. This was done during the summer, under the direction of Col. Saltonstall, who in effect rebuilt the works and mounted upon them all the can-

¹ Heads of Inquiry, printed by order of the Governor and Company; T. Green, 1775.

² Council Records, (Hinman, App.,) p. 545.

non in the town. It will be recollected that this fortification stood near the water's edge, where is now the ferry wharf. Here was the battlement, the platform, the cannon and the flag-staff; the magazine stood a little to the west. The garrison, from twelve to twenty men, had their meals at Potter's, near Bradley Street. Nathaniel Saltonstall, captain; Stephen Hempstead, lieutenant.

On the Groton side of the river, with a spirit of enthusiasm that did not wait for legislative aid, the inhabitants voluntarily threw up intrenchments, excavated ditches and erected breastworks, at sundry exposed places, which, though they had no ordnance except a few pieces at the principal battery on the heights, obtained from the supply brought in by Commodore Hopkins, they resolved to defend to the last extremity.

On the river below Norwich, (at Waterman's Point,) a battery was erected under the superintendence of Benjamin Huntington and Ephraim Bill, and furnished with four six-pounders. Such were the preparations made to receive the enemy in 1775.¹

Two enlisted companies were stationed at New London, during the summer, under Major Latimer and Capt. Edward Shipman, of Saybrook.² These were ordered to Boston the last of September, on the requisition of General Washington. Their place was supplied by a new enlistment of seventy men, of whom Col. Saltonstall took the command.³

The governor and council of safety, acceding to the oft-repeated request of the inhabitants that something further might be done for them in the way of fortification, sent Col. Jedediah Elderkin to New London, in November, to view the premises and report what fortification was necessary. After a general survey and consultation with the principal men on both sides of the river, he confirmed the judgment heretofore given by the committee, and recommended the immediate fortification of the three points designated by them.

The neck of land bounding New London Harbor on the south, now called Fort Neck, but then generally known by its Indian name of Mamakuk, (or Mamacock,) presented near the point a broad, irregular platform of rocks, rising twenty feet above the water, and con-

¹ Council Records in Hinman, pp. 828, 831.

² Ibid, p. 828.

³ At the same time thirty were ordered for New Haven, forty for Stonington, and fifteen for Lyme. The pay was the same as to continental soldiers, which in 1775, was £2 per month for a private, and £6 for a captain; five shillings and three pence per week for billeting. Ibid, p. 191.

nected with the main land on the east by meadows and marshes. This rocky point seems to have been projected into its position purposely to protect the harbor. A more advantageous site for a fortification is scarcely to be desired. Could we allow that the benevolence of nature would concur in any of the plans of war, we might suppose that this use of it had entered into her design ; for it is not only well adapted to this end, but seems nearly useless for any other purpose. On this point, Col. Elderkin proposed the erection of a rampart fronting east, eighty feet ; south, eighty feet ; north, eighty feet, but not at right angles ; with five embrasures in each bank, to be defended by five cannon, eighteen or twenty-four-pounders.

The point selected on the Groton side was nearly opposite the center of the harbor. The ascent, within fifty rods of the water's edge, was 120 feet. The summit was tolerably level. Here it was supposed that a breastwork of turf and gravel, with some ten pieces of cannon, would be all that was necessary.

Winthrop's Neck lies north-east of the town, and projects more than half-way across the harbor ; the southern extremity, facing the mouth of the river, presents a level, bold bluff, twenty feet above the water. Here, also, it was recommended that a breastwork should be raised, and planted with ten cannon. These various positions would expose an invading fleet to be raked at so many angles, that it was thought the inhabitants might thus be rendered secure from all annoyance by sea.

The report of Col. Elderkin was made to the governor and council, November 15th,¹ and on the 22d, orders were issued for the works to be commenced, under the direction of a committee of six persons, Col. Saltonstall, Ebenezer Ledyard, John Deshon, Nathaniel Shaw, Jun., Peter Avery and Josiah Watrous (or Waters).² Yet notwithstanding this early and earnest action of the government, more than a year elapsed before either of the posts could take rank as a fortification, and merit a name. Even in December, 1776, when the two principal works were honored with the names of the governor and deputy-governor, Trumbull and Griswold, they were imperfect and unfinished.

Nor is this a matter of surprise when it is considered that the labor

¹ Elderkin's report, in Hinman's App., p. 551. The land at Mamacock was purchased of Nathaniel Shaw; an acre and a quarter for the works at Groton, of Jonathan Chester and Elisha Prior. Groton fort was commenced December 5th, 1776.

² Hinman, p. 837.

was performed by relays of fresh recruits, changed every few weeks, who wrought under the direction of the civil authority and field-officers. These enlistments consisted in part of mere boys, with the spirit indeed, but not the experience of men, and in part of aged persons, who had perhaps the judgment, but not the physical energy of maturity.

It is interesting to note the difficulties which in those revolutionary times stood in the way of public works. In the case of these small fortifications, the legislature must first discuss the matter and pass the resolves ; the governor and council of safety must take it up ; Col. Saltonstall must be consulted ; Mr. Shaw must be summoned to Hartford, to give advice ; Col. Mott must be sent to New London, to survey ; Col. Dyer and Mr. Wales must examine and report. The works begin, stop, go on. The governor and council are at the trouble of directing just the number of sledges, hammers, shovels, spades, crow-bars, pickaxes, chains, &c., that are to be provided for the work. Timber, teams, tools, and other necessary materials are to be procured by Col. Saltonstall, for Winthrop's Neck ; by Ebenezer Ledyard, for Groton ; and Nathaniel Shaw, for Mamacock. The timber was in the forests, and must be selected growing.

The assembly must now apply to Congress for cannon to furnish their works, asking for some of the brass pieces taken at St. John's. Again they apply to Admiral Hopkins for some of the New Providence ordnance.¹ They can not obtain the necessary complement, and it is decided that the heavy cannon must be cast in Smith's furnace at Salisbury. In order to accomplish this, the furnace must be enlarged, new workmen obtained, higher wages given ; wood-land must be bought to obtain fuel for the furnace ; and all these details must be performed by the executive officers of the state ; Col. Elderkin and others must make journeys to and forth from Salisbury to Hartford, to manage the business.

In the summer of 1777, the works were regarded as finished, though probably then very far from what military men, at the present day, would call complete.

The engineer of Fort Trumbull was Col. Josiah Waters ; of Fort Griswold, Col. Samuel Mott.² The first commanders of these forts

¹ Council Records, p. 355, Hinman, where will be found authority for most of the particulars in this sketch.

² Their appointment as engineers was in February, 1776, but Col. Waters had been previously on duty. His services commenced November 29th, 1775, and he was still at his post in April, 1777, as was also his assistant, Josiah Waters, Jun. Hinman, p. 430.

were appointed in February, 1776, and were captains of companies stationed at each place ; John Ely, of Lyme, at Mamacock, and Edward Mott, at Groton,¹ but in July, before the forts were half completed, they were both promoted to the rank of major. Their successors were Martin Kirtland, of Saybrook, for Mamacock, and Oliver Coit, for Groton. Two artillery companies, one for each fortress, were afterward raised, and of these Nathaniel Saltonstall and William Ledyard were the first captains. These must be regarded as the first actual commanders of Forts Trumbull and Griswold. They were appointed July 3d, 1776.² At the same date, Adam Shapley was ordered to take command of the old fort at New London, in the place of Dudley Saltonstall, resigned.

August 2d, 1777, orders were issued by the governor and council to remove the platform from the old fort to Fort Trumbull. The barrack, also, was soon transferred to the lower part of the town, and being subsequently used for a brewery, gave the name of Brewery, (now Brewer,) to the street in which it was placed. The old battery was left to decay, and its site afterward appropriated to the market and the ferry wharf.

A redoubt on Winthrop's Neck was erected by Col. Saltonstall. The importance of the site was overrated, and in the course of a year or two the post was abandoned.

For the garrisoning of the various posts at New London and Groton, a regiment of foot was employed during a part of the year 1776, of which Col. Erastus Wolcott had the command. He was the superior military commander of the district which included Stonington, for that year. Dr. John Ely of Lyme performed a tour of duty here, as captain and major, and also as physician and surgeon. In July he was sent to visit the northern army and employ his skill in arresting the small-pox, which was then raging in the camp with great virulence.

In the various battalions raised for continental service, New London was expected to furnish her full quota ; though, as we look back upon her exposed situation, we might deem that the services of her sons were of pressing necessity at home. Mr. Shaw, in writing to Governor Trumbull, Aug. 7th, 1776, when new enlistments were demanded, observes :

1 Hinman, pp. 346, 364.

2 Ibid, pp. 365, 366.

"This town has been drained of men already, so that there is scarcely a sufficiency of hands left to get in the harvest."

In addition to the regular militia then in service, in June a large volunteer company was recruited in the town under Capt. Richard Deshon, and another in November, under Capt. Jonathan Caulkins. Groton was in a similar condition, nearly all its able-bodied men were in the army. In October, 1775, she had memorialized the assembly, praying that her soldiers might be allowed to return and defend their own homes, for the British fleet was hovering near them, and the coast had been stripped of its men to recruit the army and navy. This was the sad truth, which might have been repeated every year of the war.

How shall we describe the shifting scenes of plunder, stratagem and atrocity, exhibited on the bosom of Long Island Sound, during the years 1776 and 1777? What fury possessed the minds of men, that the inhabitants of the two shores, old neighbors and friendly associates, should thus become assassins and wolves, prowling for each other's destruction!

Long Island, having passed in a great measure into the occupation of the British, those inhabitants who had embraced the cause of liberty, were obliged to seek safety by flight. The troops stationed at New London, with all the armament that the governor could command, were ordered to cross the Sound and assist in removing them and their effects to the Connecticut coast. Many of these unfortunate patriots, left all behind them, and homeless and destitute were thrown upon the mercy of the charitable. Long Island was abandoned by the Genius of Liberty, and the British rule was spread over it, far and wide. From that moment the two coasts were hostile, and an inveterate system of smuggling, marauding, plundering and kidnapping took place on both sides, in comparison with which a common state of honorable warfare might be taken for peace and good neighborhood. Sheep, cattle, effects and people, were seized and carried off by either party. On the Connecticut side this was done under the covert of secrecy. Goods stolen from the island were carefully secreted; and if discovered by honest persons were advertised, and the owners desired to come and take possession. This condition of affairs was fraught with mischief, misrule and villainy. There was no end to the *strays* and the *thieves*. Akin to this marauding system was the contraband trade—an illicit dealing with the enemy, and furnishing them with supplies for the sake of their gold, and their goods. This was not often carried on by the tories, the professed

friends of the British, for they were too narrowly watched to allow of the risk, but by men who were patriots in pretension, but yet lovers of money, rather than lovers of their country. This trade was entered into by many people who were otherwise considered fair and honorable in all their dealings; but if discovered by their countrymen, they were marked for opprobrium and insult. A more odious occupation could not be mentioned, nor could any thing be said of a man better calculated to hold him up to public indignation than to call him *a Long Island trader*. The republican authorities were rigorous in their watch upon this trade.¹ Many houses were searched and men imprisoned; yet the contraband trade flourished. Goods that were bought for country produce, might be sold cheap, and the temptation to buy was great. Fine Holland shirts ready-made could be procured for half a Spanish dollar. Sloops and boats laden with provisions for the New York market were occasionally intercepted by the state cruisers, and the sad history of the day was often enlivened by ludicrous anecdotes that would gain currency respecting these night-traders. Thus, a story was told of two men from the Great Neck shore of New London, who put off one night in a whale-boat, with a large fat ox on board. The animal got loose from its fastenings and became so unmanageable that the men, in danger of sinking, were glad to make toward a country sloop near by, and meekly surrendered their ox to confiscation and themselves to imprisonment.

On the Long Island side the harbors were infested with bands of the lowest and vilest refugees, from whence many a plundering descent was made on the Connecticut coast and robbery and extortion of every kind committed. The small sloops and boats in which these piratical excursions were made had the familiar name of Shaving-Mills. They were the terror of the coast, often committing atrocious robberies.

The present generation, living in peace and quiet, and looking round upon the goodly heritage that has fallen to their lot, think but little of those years of suffering, through which these blessings were attained. They have no adequate conception of the scenes of alarm, panic, flight, destitution, poverty, bereavement, loneliness and even famine, through which their forefathers passed in the fierce struggle

¹ Shaw to Governor Trumbull, Feb., 1777; "I suppose Gen. Parsons has given you a history of the discovery we made of the correspondence carried on from our Neck on board the man-of-war." Shaw's Letter Book. (MS.)

for liberty. During the whole war, the inhabitants of New London could never lie down with any feeling of security that they might not be roused from their beds by the alarm bell and the signal fire, proclaiming the invader at hand. There was indeed, in the early part of the war, no spoil to allure an enemy; but the harbor, spacious, accessible and secure, would furnish a fine winter refuge for their ships, and it would be a vast benefit to their cause to seal up the state and have the whole Sound to themselves.

During the winter of 1776-7, the frigates *Amazon* and *Niger* were stationed most of the time near the west end of Fisher's Island, so as effectually to blockade the mouth of the river. Several British vessels also wintered in Gardiner's Bay, and the Sound was the common haunt of the enemy. On the 3d of December, 1776, eleven ships passed Montauk Point and anchored within sight of the town. The next morning they were joined by a fleet of transports and war-like vessels approaching eastward from New York, which gradually increased to 100 in number. This fleet, which was under the command of Sir Peter Parker, while maneuvering in the Sound made a truly formidable appearance. They remained nearly three weeks, recruiting where they could on the shores and islands—often secretly supplied by faithless men from the coast—and stretching their wings from Gardiner's Bay to Fairfield. New London was in daily apprehension of a bombardment. The women and children and all valuable goods were removed. On Friday, Dec. 20th, the admiral having collected together his transports and made his preparations, began to weigh anchor. At that moment the public consternation was greater perhaps than has ever been experienced, before or since, on this coast. When this magnificent fleet came abreast the mouth of the river it seemed sufficient to sweep the foundation of the town from its moorings. Astonishment and dismay filled the minds of the inhabitants as from hill-tops and house-tops, they gazed on the distant spectacle. After a short period of intense anxiety, a sudden relief was experienced, as the leading ships passed off to the south and east of Fisher's Island, and it became apparent that Newport was to be the point of attack. The governor had ordered out all the militia east of the river and three regiments from the west side; but the orders were countermanded when the destination of the fleet was ascertained.¹

¹ Col. John Douglas was encamped here with his regiment. In January, 1777, Col. John Ely's regiment on duty at New London was ordered to Providence. He was remanded with four companies in March.

The 14th of March, 1777, brought another breeze of alarm along the coast. A fleet of eleven sail—the Amazon, Greyhound, Lark and seven transports—came round the western point of Fisher's Island, and anchored near the Groton shore. An immediate descent was expected, and tumult and terror reigned for a time in the town. The object of the squadron, however, was to obtain, as they had the year before, the stock of Fisher's Island, and this business they executed so thoroughly, as almost to sweep the island clean of produce. They took not only sheep, cattle, swine, poultry, corn, potatoes, wood and hay, but blankets, woolen cloth, sheeting and other necessaries, for all which they made a reasonable compensation to Mr. Brown, in British gold.

While the enemy thus kept possession of the Sound, the sloops and boats belonging to the coast, melted away like summer snow. The Amazon frigate kept a continual watch at the mouth of the river, capturing and destroying coasters and fishing vessels without mercy. Through the whole year 1777, New London was blockaded almost with the strictness of a siege.

April 12th, about thirty sail of armed vessels and transports passed along the mouth of the river: in fact, during the whole of this momentous summer the threatening aspect of a man-of-war, was scarcely absent from the vision of the inhabitants; and from the high grounds twenty were frequently in view at one time, either at anchor, or flying east and west where, at the two extremities of the Sound, the strong forces of the enemy held undisputed possession of Newport and New York. May and June were months of almost continual alarm.

On the 20th of July a squadron appeared on the coast bending its course as if about to enter the mouth of the river. The alarm guns were fired and the militia set in motion; but it proved to be a fleet of transports and provision vessels bound to England under convoy of the Niger frigate. They passed by without any hostile demonstration but that of firing several shot at the armed schooner Spy, which they chased into the harbor. The next day, the Spy slipped out of the river, and cut off from the fleet two vessels that had lingered to take in wood.

In August, the Cerberus frigate lay for some time at anchor, off Niantic Bay, west of New London. A line was one day seen from the ship floating upon the water at a little distance, which the tender of the ship was ordered to examine. It was drawn up with great caution, and found to be 150 fathoms in length, and to have a ma-

chine attached to the end of it, weighing about 400 pounds. This, upon being hauled into the schooner, exploded on the deck, and as was currently reported at the time, killed several men.¹ The machine was undoubtedly one of the marine torpedoes invented by Mr. Bushnell, to blow up ships. This ingenious gentleman and patriotic soldier made other attempts to destroy a British vessel with his machine, but failed.

In September, thirty or forty sail of English vessels were at one time in the Sound; many of them taking in wood from the Long Island shore.

In November, about the 14th, a fleet of vessels of all descriptions passing from Newport to Gardiner's Bay, encountered a gale of wind, by which the Syren frigate of twenty-eight guns was driven ashore at Point Judith and fell into the hands of the Americans with her crew (200 men) and equipments. She was stripped of her guns, stores, and every thing movable, and burnt; Sunday Nov. 15th.

The military organization for the coast defense was arranged anew for the year 1777. The three posts of New London, Groton and Stonington were placed under the command of Major Jonathan Wells of Hartford. Two companies were raised and stationed at New London; one of artillery consisting of fifty men, of which Nathaniel Saltonstall was captain; the other of musketry, (seventy men,) of which Adam Shapley was captain. Two corresponding companies stationed at Groton were commanded by Wm. Ledyard and Oliver Coit; and a company of musket men was stationed at Stonington under Capt. Nathan Palmer. This was the stationary force for the year; but being totally inadequate to the necessity, a regiment was raised expressly to defend the coast of New London county. Before this could be enlisted, Colonels Latimer, Ely and Throop, and Majors Buel and Gallop, performed tours of duty at New London and Groton, with parts of their respective regiments.

In March, 1778, Capt. William Ledyard was appointed to the command of the posts of New London, Groton and Stonington, with the rank and pay of major. Under his direction the works were repaired and strengthened and additional batteries erected. William Latham was captain of artillery at Groton, and Adam Shapley at New London. These appointments, it must be remembered, were not made by Congress or the commander-in-chief, but emanated from the governor and council of safety.

¹ This incident is more minutely related in Thatcher's Military Journal, p. 123.

Early in this year, a French ship called the Lyon, Capt. Michel, came into port with a valuable assortment of West India goods. This cargo was very opportune, being mostly purchased by the naval agent for the state and continental service. She had salt on board, which was then of pressing importance to the army; and linen and other articles useful for the clothing of soldiers. The Lyon lay about three months in the harbor.¹ Several privateers were in at the same time recruiting, and the collisions that took place among the seamen, soldiery and populace, kept the town in a state of riot and disorder. The jail was forced, prisoners released and recaptured, and mobs occasionally triumphant over the law. When a maritime war is raging, what can be expected in a seaport but misrule and demoralization?

Flags of truce engaged in the exchange of prisoners were often arriving and departing from New London. The return home of American prisoners excited very naturally a deep interest. Their appearance alone without a word spoken, was sufficient evidence that they had borne a rigorous confinement under merciless keepers. In July, 1777, a flag that had been sent to Newport with a band of well-fed, healthy English prisoners to be exchanged, returned with a company of Americans who were actually dying from starvation and close confinement. "They had but just life enough remaining," said the Gazette, "to answer the purpose of an exchange." Some were wasted to skeletons, others covered with vermin, or disfigured with eruptions, or dying of fever. Early in August, two other exchanges were negotiated and some fifty more arrived in the same condition. Unwholesome and scanty fare, crowded quarters, the want of fresh air and uncleanliness, had brought them to the verge of the grave. Some indeed died in the cartel before they reached the harbor, and some soon after their arrival. The few that remained meager, pale and tottering, crept slowly along the highways begging their way to their homes.

In the month of December, 1778, by flags and cartels from New York about 500 prisoners arrived, released said the Gazette "from the horrible prison ships." They were sick with various diseases—they had frozen limbs—and many were infected with the small-pox.

¹ The Lyon took in a cargo for Virginia and sailed June 14th. A little south of Long Island she had an engagement of four hours' duration with a British frigate and then escaped. On her voyage from Virginia to France, laden with tobacco, she was captured by an English vessel of forty guns.

They died all along the way through the Sound, and every day after their arrival for three weeks; sixteen the first week, seventeen the next, and so on. About 200 were Frenchmen, and of these fifteen died on the passage from New York. These poor foreigners were destitute of money and suitable clothing; and the high price of the necessaries of life, the gloom of the winter season, and the loathsome diseases among them, made it no light task to render them comfortable. The small-pox and malignant fevers brought in by the prisoners, were communicated to those whose benevolent ministrations afforded them relief, and in this way were spread through the town. The prejudices against inoculation were so strong that notwithstanding it had a resolve of the General Assembly and a previous vote of the town in its favor, it had never been allowed. Infected persons were carried apart, and shut up by themselves, with the white cloth floating over them to betoken pestilence.

With respect to the American prisoners, historic justice calls upon us to state, that those who were exchanged in later periods of the war, gave evidence of a beneficial change in the mode of treatment. The British had learned a lesson of humanity. In August, 1779, when the crew of the Oliver Cromwell were released, they came home in good health, and frankly acknowledged that though they had been confined in those odious prison ships, the Jersey and Good-hope, they had been kindly treated, provided with good food, the sick attended by physicians, and nothing plundered from them.

In the year 1778, a prison ship was fitted up at New London, by order of Congress, for the reception of British prisoners, with a guard attached to it, consisting of a lieutenant, sergeant, corporal, and twenty privates.¹ It was used only a short time.

The events of the year 1779 seem like those of previous years, rehearsed over as in a scenic exhibition, with only slight changes of names and drapery. In February, a detachment of continental troops, under the command of Col. Dearborn, was sent to aid the militia in the defense of New London. Brigadier-General Parsons had the superior military command of the district.

N. Shaw, to the Marine Committee of the Eastern Department, March 14th, 1779.

“ We are in such a wretched state in this town by reason of the small-pox, fever and famine, that I can not carry on my business, and am laying up my vessels as fast as they come in, for every necessary of life is at such an extrav-

¹ Council Records, (Hinman,) p. 531.

agent price that whenever I employ persons to do any thing, they insist upon provisions, which it is not in my power to give them."

On the 23d of March, several scouting vessels came in, with the startling intelligence that a fleet of twenty sail had passed Hurlgate, and were coming east, with flat-bottomed boats, row-galleys and sloops of war in train ; that a sixty-four and a fifty gun ship had left Sandy Hook, to come south of Long Island, around Montauk into the Sound ; that twenty-six sail of vessels had previously congregated at Sagharbor, and that General Clinton had left New York, and was mustering a large body of troops at Southampton. The same day a considerable force was seen to go into Gardiner's Bay, and about sunset the frigate Renown appeared off the mouth of the river and anchored. To what could all these preparations tend but an attack upon New London ?

And now as on similar occasions, the alarm-bells were rung, and the bale-fires lighted. Families were broken up, effects removed, and the neighboring militia came straggling in to the defense. But no attack was made. It was expected the next day, and the next ; and a whole week passed of agitation and uncertainty. It was then ascertained that the transports from New York had gone to Newport ; that the fleet under convoy, which had halted in Gardiner's Bay, was bound to New York ; that a part of the other fleet had gone on a plundering expedition to the Vineyard Sound and Falmouth, (now Portland, in Maine,) and that on the opposite coast of Long Island, from whence the invading army was expected to embark, all was quiet and peaceful. No flat-bottomed boats were there, nor had been. The only force collected on that side of the island, consisted of 500 foot and fifty horse at Southold, and 100 men with two field-pieces at Sagharbor, which was a stationary arrangement to guard and assist the English vessels in taking off wood and hay. It is a little singular that the troops at Southampton had been assembled in consequence of unfounded reports of a similar nature, that had been flying through the British lines. It was confidently affirmed in New York that General Parsons was at New London, with a body of 4,000 men, making hasty but secret preparations for a descent upon Long Island. In consequence of this report, General Clinton had hastened from New York, with a flying force, to prepare a reception for the expected invader. In this manner, rumor flew from side to side, imagining evil, asserting its existence, and actually caus-

ing it to exist. False report, though but a breath of air, has a mighty agency in aggravating the calamities of war.

The militia on duty at this time in New London, were employed in erecting a fortification of timber, sods, &c., on Town Hill, which it was supposed would be of use in checking the advance of an enemy that might land below the harbor, and march to attack the town in the rear. Near this spot the gallows had stood on which Kate Garrett, the Pequot woman, had perished ; it had likewise been noted for a large wind-mill. A breastwork was here thrown up, and several field-pieces mounted. The inhabitants showed their appreciation of the work, by the name which they bestowed on it, Fort Non-sense, the only name it ever received.

The next alarm was on the 25th of June, when warning guns from Stonington gave notice of an approaching fleet. Forts Trumbull and Griswold took up the notes, and echoed them into the country. In the afternoon a squadron of about fifty sail, of which seven were ships, and the others of various size and armament, down to row-galleys, came within sight of the town. They anchored near Plum Island, for the night, and the next morning, instead of turning toward the town, as had been feared, they made sail to the westward. The militia had come in, as was observed, "with even greater cheerfulness and alacrity" than on former occasions. The brigade of General Tyler was on the ground, and being paraded, was dismissed with addresses and thanks.

Only ten days later, (July 5th,) a similar alarm agitated the coast. Expresses from the westward to Major Ledyard, brought information that a fleet had left New York, with preparations for a descent on the coast, and was on its way through the Sound. The point of attack at this time proved to be New Haven, but New London was closely watched. The frigates Renown and Thames, and the sloop of war Otter, were plying in the neighborhood, and it was thought an attack would soon be made. A large body of militia remained three weeks, encamped near the town, or in Groton. General Tyler's brigade, from Preston and Norwich, was again noted for its promptness and martial spirit. The counties of Berkshire and Hampshire, in Massachusetts, sent their militia to aid in the defense of the coast. No attempt was, however, made by the enemy to land, except upon Plum and Fisher's Islands, which the crews of the British ships plundered of every thing valuable to them, and then wantonly set fire to the hay and buildings, which they could not remove.

The year 1780 shows but little variation of picture from the three

preceding years. The cold months were seasons of pinching poverty and distress; sudden outbreaks of alarm and confusion were thickly scattered over the summer. Frigates and other vessels were continually passing up and down the Sound, and ships of the line were now hovering near Block Island, now anchoring at Point Judith, now running into Gardiner's Bay. On the 29th of July, the governor having received information that twenty sail of shipping, with 8,000 troops on board, were in Huntington Harbor, Long Island, immediately ordered out a body of militia to the defense of New London, but on the 31st, the much dreaded fleet made sail for New York. On the 5th of August, a fleet of fifteen vessels, under the command of Admiral Graves, anchored off the harbor, and there lay about twenty-four hours, before running into Gardiner's Bay. This fleet had been on watch over the French, at Newport, and came into the Sound to collect stock and recruit. In September, another British fleet, said to be Admiral Arbuthnot's, came into Gardiner's Bay, and there remained through the months of October and November.

It would be a laborious but pleasing task to go around among families, with a talisman to gain their confidence, read private letters, inspect documents, converse with the aged, take notes of tradition, and thus gather up and revive the fading names of patriots and heroes who assisted in the achievement of American independence. It was an era of brave and self-denying men, and even confining our attention to the limited sphere embraced in this history, the number is not small of those who performed deeds worthy of remembrance. If only a few are here introduced, let it not be deemed that injustice is thereby shown to others, who may be equally worthy, but less generally known.

General Gurdon Saltonstall, and three of his sons, were employed in various grades of service, during the whole war. The elder Saltonstall, before the close of 1776, was raised to the rank of brigadier-general, and sent with nine regiments of Connecticut militia, to take post in Westchester county, New York. He was then sixty-eight years of age. Winthrop Saltonstall, the oldest of the brothers, held the office of register of the court of admiralty. Dudley was a captain, and then commodore in the navy. Gilbert, the youngest, was a captain of marines, on board the ship Trumbull, in her desperate combat with the Watt.

Nathaniel Saltonstall, of another family, served in the war, both as seaman and soldier. He was captain of the old fort, on the Parade, and commander of the ship Putnam.

Major James Chapman, of Selden's regiment, Wadsworth's brigade, was a man of strength and stature beyond the common standard, and as a soldier steady and brave. But what avail these qualities against the aim of the marksman, or the force of a cannon ball! He was slain in what was called *the orchard fight*, near Harlem, when the army was retreating from New York, September 15th, 1776. His son James, a youth of only fifteen years of age, was with him when he fell. His brother, Lieut. Richard Chapman, was slain in Groton fort. John Chapman, a third brother, was first lieutenant of the ship Oliver Cromwell, and after that was taken, of the Putnam. Joseph Chapman, a still younger brother, was an officer of the army.

Col. Jonathan Latimer, (of Chesterfield society,) had served in several campaigns against the French upon the northern frontier, and during the war for independence, was much of the time in the field.¹ Two of his sons, George and Jonathan, were also in the service.¹ Major Christopher Darrow (of the North Parish) fought bravely at Monmouth, and on other battle-fields during the war. The Gallops, of Groton, Ben-Adam and Nathan, were engaged in some of the earliest struggles, and both field-officers in 1777.

William and Alexander P. Adams, grandsons of the former minister Adams, Richard Douglas, Thomas U. Fosdick, Edward and George Hallam, Stephen Hempstead, George Hurlbut, John and William Raymond, William Richards—these were all young men, starting forth impulsively at the commencement of the struggle, with high heroic purpose to serve their country, and if the sacrifice should be demanded, to suffer and die in the cause of liberty. William Adams served in the army during the siege of Boston, but afterward enlisting in a private armed vessel, he died at Martinique, April 4th, 1778. His brother, purser of the ship Trumbull, was cut off at sea, before the close of the war. Douglas, Fosdick, Hempstead, Richards, were in the service from 1776 to the disbanding of the army. The last named, Capt. William Richards, was stationed in 1780, at Fairfield, and while there was engaged in the expedition against Fort Slongo, on the opposite shore of Long Island. They crossed by night with muffled oars, took the works by surprise, and demolished them. Major Tallmage was the commander of the party. Captain Richards led the attack upon the battery. Edward Hallam, after a

¹ Col. Latimer was the father of ten sons; himself and six of them, measured forty-two feet. An ancient Mumford family, of Groton, approached the same mark, having six members of the average height of six feet; according to familiar report, "thirty-six feet of Mumford in one family."

tour of duty at Boston, and another at New York, was appointed commissary of troops at New London. William Raymond, taken prisoner in an early part of the contest, was carried to Halifax, and died, while immured in Mill-island prison.

George Hurlbut and Robert Hallam, with a multitude of others, shouldered musket and knapsack, and started for Boston, immediately after intelligence was received of the skirmish at Lexington. They subsequently joined Capt. Coit's company, and fought at Bunker Hill, one nineteen years of age, and the other twenty-one. Hallam's commission from Congress, giving him the rank of captain in Colonel Durkee's regiment, was dated July 3d, 1777, the very month that he was twenty years of age. He fought at Trenton, Princeton, Germantown and Monmouth, but withdrew from the army at the close of the campaign of 1779.

Captain Hurlbut remained in the service till disabled by a mortal wound, at Tarrytown, in the summer of 1781. For the exploit that cost him, in the end, his life, he received the thanks of Washington, in the public orders of the army. It merits a particular relation.

A vessel in the river containing a considerable quantity of stores for the American army, had been set on fire by the guns of the enemy. Capt. Hurlbut being an excellent swimmer, volunteered his service, swam to the vessel, and amidst a severe fire from the British ships, extinguished the flames, cut the cable, that the wind might drift her to the side where the Americans were encamped, and then took to the water again. Before reaching the shore, being much fatigued, he threw himself on his back, as swimmers often do for repose, and just then was struck in the groin by a grape shot. The ball was successfully extracted, and after a long confinement, he so far recovered as to appear abroad. He belonged to the second regiment of light dragoons, and the first time that he was able to resume his post, the troops honored him with a salute. Unfortunately his horse became restive, reared and threw him. The old wound was broken up, he languished many months in severe pain, and at last was brought home to die. The commander-in-chief himself gave orders that every requisite care and attention should be used in his removal. His friend, Mr. Colfax, and the surgeon, Dr. Eustis, (afterward governor of Massachusetts,) accompanied him to New London, where he expired 8th of May, 1783.¹

¹ Many of these particulars are taken from a certificate given in December, 1783, by General Washington, to Mrs. Welsh, a widowed sister of Capt. Hurlbut.

In this connection another army incident may be mentioned, which, though in result a failure, illustrates the daring spirit of adventure for which the New London men of that day, whether sailors or soldiers, were remarkable.

On the 16th of August, 1776, Commodore Tupper, lying at New York, sent two fire-vessels, a sloop and a schooner, up the river to make an attempt to burn the British frigate, Phenix, in the night. Of the eighteen men detached on this expedition, a large proportion were from New London. Stephen Hempstead and Thomas Updike Fosdick were two of the number. Fosdick, who was then an ensign in the company of Captain Nathan Hale, had command of the sloop. Owing to accidental circumstances, the enterprise failed; but it was well conceived, and as far as it went, executed with boldness and skill.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Letters of marque and reprisal.—Capt. Elisha Hinman.—Other sea-captains.—The Schooner Spy.—Brig Defence.—Ship Oliver Cromwell.—Brig Resistance.—Private ship Trumbull.—Ship Confederacy.—Privateering.—Private ship Deane.—Winter of 1779-80.—Ship Putnam.—Continental Ship Trumbull.

WHILE humanity, reason and religion, concur in deprecating the whole practice of war, and look forward with ardent aspiration to the time when other modes of accommodating the difficulties of nations shall prevail, we must not withhold from the brave soldier and adventurous seaman, that species of fame and merit, which is their due. If we would write history faithfully, we must go back to the era, and live and breathe in the scenes described. We must not look at the war of the Revolution by that light which has but just begun to dawn on the Christian world in regard to the folly and iniquity of war. Men fought under an exalted impulse for their homes and firesides, their liberties and their altars. It was the way in which the age manifested its devotion to truth, freedom, law and religion. Yet blessed will be the period when these sacred principles shall find a holier expression.

It has been customary to make a distinction between the regular navy of the country and those private armed vessels, called letters of marque, or privateers, as if the former were an honorable service, and the latter but little removed from piracy. The distinction is unjust; one was as fair and lawful as the other. Both were sanctioned by the custom of nations; the object of each was the same. The continental vessels no less than the privateers seized upon peaceful merchantmen; and as much historical credit should be awarded to the brave privateersman, as to the commissioned officer.

It is a fact also, that has not been sufficiently noticed in respect to

the seamen of the Revolution, that, often with undaunted spirit they went into battle against fearful odds, and in these unequal combats were not unfrequently successful—such power has Providence given to those who manfully contend for the right.

The British after gaining possession of New York, fitted out a host of privateers from that port and from Long Island, that infested the Sound and the whole New England coast, and in the course of a few months nearly every packet, coaster and fishing smack belonging to New London was captured or destroyed. The inhabitants were driven in self-defense to build privateers and to arm as cruisers whatever craft they had left, or could seize in their turn from the enemy, and set them afloat to defend their property.

Aggression, leading to retaliation, and swaying back and forth over an increasing space with accelerated fury is the diagram of war.

A place, whose great and almost sole advantage consists in commercial aptitude, is necessarily dependant upon peace for prosperity. From the beginning to the close of the revolutionary contest a cloud of depressing gloom hung over New London. Her mariners and artisans were deprived of employment; her shopmen and merchants were impoverished or bankrupt; religion, education and morals were at a low ebb, and the shadows grew deeper from year to year.

It may be doubted whether any two places in New England, exhibited a greater contrast in these respects, than those near neighbors, but by no means intimate friends, Norwich and New London. Norwich suffered in her commerce as well as New London; but she was not kept in continual jeopardy: extraordinary inroads excepted, she was safe from invasion. Her growth was scarcely checked by the war, and setting aside the suffering from scarcity in the first years of the conflict, and the family privations resulting from the drain on the male population for the army, her prosperity was but little diminished. It was a place of refuge for many families from Boston, Newport and other exposed situations on the coast, and this influx of residents, kept her currency easy. With a wise foresight and a prompt enterprise, favored by her situation and natural advantages, she early turned her attention to manufactures. These came in to fill the vacuum occasioned by her lost commerce.

New London had no such wholesome resource. The privateering business very naturally stepped in, and as far as bustle and excitement went, filled the void; but as a path to gain, it was fraught with hazard and uncertainty. Neither merchants nor adventurers acquired wealth by privateering. Even the most fortunate commanders

barely obtained a competent livelihood, for the time being, for their families. The history of the most successful is comprehended in two or three profitable voyages, a few brilliant exploits, and then capture and imprisonment.

The alternations in this warfare succeeded each other like cloud and sunshine in an April day. The excitement of hazardous undertakings, and the sudden changes continually taking place, gave to life a romantic and vivid interest. Often when the Sound was apparently pervaded by British vessels, a letter-of-marque would seize a favorable opportunity, push out of port, and return with a prize. As connected with New London, sea skirmishes and naval disasters were prominent features of the war. A band of sea-captains, prompt, valiant, experienced and danger-loving, had their rendezvous in this port. Some were natives of the town; others belonged in Groton, Norwich, Middletown and Saybrook.

Capt. Elisha Hinman was the youngest of three brothers who came from Woodbury, Conn., before or about 1760, and established themselves in New London. He was a veteran of the sea, before the commencement of the Revolution, and took an early part in the contest. He commanded the *Cabot*, a continental brig in the squadron of Commodore Hopkins, and afterward succeeded Paul Jones in the ship *Alfred*, which he was unfortunately obliged to surrender to the *Ariadne* and *Ceres*, on a return voyage from France, March 9th, 1778. Being carried a prisoner to England, after a short confinement he found friends who aided his escape to France, from whence he returned home, and engaged for a time in private adventures. In 1779, he went out in the privateer sloop *Hancock*, owned by Thomas Mumford, and had a run of brilliant, dashing success. In 1780, he took command of the armed ship *Deane*.

Peter Richards, Charles Bulkley, and John Welsh, the lieutenants of Capt. Hinman in the *Alfred*, were confined in England for several months in Fortune Prison, near Portsmouth, from whence they escaped by digging under the outward wall, and reaching the coast of France in safety, returned home in the spring of 1779. These all went out subsequently in private armed vessels.

William Havens, Nicoll Fosdick, Samuel and Lodowick Champlin, William Leeds, Daniel Deshon, Nathaniel Saltonstall—seamen more brave and skillful than these to harass an enemy or defend a coast, can not be found at any period of our country's history. The merchant service was not wholly abandoned during the war. Several of the commanders that have been named, and others, made occasional voy-

ages to French ports, though in general with some armature. Capt. William Rogers made a safe voyage to France and back again in 1779. Several cases occurred in which vessels that sailed before the war, unarmed, were long detained in foreign ports, and even laid up till the return of peace. Capt. John Lamb, sent by Nathaniel Shaw, in the ship *America* to Gibraltar, in 1774, was absent three years, the owner in the mean time receiving no remittances.¹ Capt. James Rogers, arrested by the war in a foreign port, suffered a detention of six years, but arrived in safety with his vessel, in September, 1781.

New London Harbor was the recruiting ground of the state schooner *Spy*, Capt. Robert Niles—a fortunate vessel with a skillful commander, which performed good service during the whole war, and closed her accounts in neat and beautiful style, by carrying safely to France the first copy of the ratified treaty of peace. This vessel was of fifty tuns burden, carried six guns, (four-pounders,) and from twenty to thirty men. Her cruises were short, but she was continually upon the look-out; ever ready, ever serviceable; alert in discovering smugglers, intercepting unlawful communications, taking, prizes, and giving notice of the movements of the enemy. She sailed from Stonington with a copy of the ratified treaty, and arrived at Brest in twenty-one days, having passed undiscovered through a British fleet that lay off that port; owing her safety, probably, to her diminutive size, which prevented her character from being suspected.

The brig *Defence*, fourteen guns, built by the state in 1775, at the ship-yard of Capt. Uriah Hayden, in Connecticut River, was brought round to New London to be equipped, and to enlist her crew of one hundred and twenty men. She sailed on her first cruise in May, 1776, under Capt. Seth Harding, and in the course of it took two transport ships and a brig, all bringing Highland recruits to the British army. The *Defence* enjoyed a couple of years of prosperity, often dropping into New London Harbor to recruit. Three of her lieutenants, Leeds, Angel and Billings, had been sea-captains, sailing from the Thames. In 1778, this vessel was altered into a ship at Boston, and the command given to Capt. Samuel Smedley; but her career was closed March 10th, 1779, on Goshen Reef, within sight of New London. She struck, bilged, overset and went to pieces, as

¹ Lamb arrived at Boston, from Martinico, in Dec., 1777, in a brig called the *Irish Gimblet*. Among his lading were seventeen brass cannon, with other warlike stores, for Congress, shipped by William Bingham, of St. Peters, Martinico.

she was about to enter the harbor from a successful cruise. Several of her crew perished in the hold.

Another state brig, called the *Old Defence*, under the command of Capt. Daniel Deshon, was taken in January, 1778, by the enemy, and carried into Jamaica.

The *Oliver Cromwell*, a twenty gun ship, built at Saybrook in 1776 by the state, was also fitted out from New London. Her first commander was Capt. William Coit, and she was expected to sail in October, but difficulties existed among her people, and the British kept a constant watch over the harbor, so that she was detained through the winter. The next spring, Capt. Harding was transferred to her from the *Defence*, and she succeeded in getting out in May, 1777.¹ In June, she took a merchant brig, called the *Medway*, and in July the brigantine *Honor*, which sold, with her cargo, for £10,692. In September, she captured the *Weymouth Packet*, a brig of fifteen guns, which was fitted up for a cruiser, and called the *Hancock*. The *Cromwell*, after two and a half years of faithful republican service, was destined to pass into the ranks of royalty. She sailed from New London in May, 1779, in command of Capt. Timothy Parker of Norwich, a seaman of tried gallantry and experience. She was absent twelve days—sent in four prizes, two of them armed vessels, and touched in herself to land her prisoners. She sailed again the first of June, and on the fifth, off Sandy Hook, had a sharp engagement with the British frigate *Daphne*. Her mainmast being shot away, three men killed, and another ship coming up to the aid of the *Daphne*, Capt. Parker surrendered his ship. She was soon cruising again under the royal ensign, and bearing the new name of *Restoration*.²

The Continental armed brig *Resistance*, ten guns, (fours,) Capt. Samuel Chew, was fitted out at New London at the suggestion, and under the orders of Nathaniel Shaw.³ The officers were mostly New

1 In March, 1777, on the day of the marriage of Capt. Elisha Hinman, the officers of the *Oliver Cromwell* ordered a complimentary salute to be fired from the ship. Some mischief-lover among the crew, charged the cannon with a hand grenade, which "whistled through the town the like was never known." The terrified inhabitants caused the offender to be arrested and put in irons.

2 From a New York (royalist) paper of July 24th, 1779. "The frigate *Restoration* (formerly the *Oliver Cromwell*) is now fitting for sea, and will be ready in six days to join the associated refugee fleet, lying in Huntington Harbor, and intending soon to pay a visit to the rebel coast."

3 "It gives me pleasure to hear of Capt. Chew's success, as the fitting him out was a plan of my own." Letter to the marine committee of Congress, Feb. 2d, 1778. (MS.)

London men. On the fourth of March, 1778, in a desperate conflict in the West India seas, with a letter-of-marque, carrying twenty guns, Capt. Chew and Lieut. George Champlin, of New London, were killed.¹ The two vessels parted, and the brig was carried into Boston by Lieut. Leeds. She was taken by the British in November, and burnt.

The *Governor Trumbull*, a privateer ship of twenty guns, built in Norwich by Howland and Coit, was considered a very fine vessel. She went to sea, on her first cruise, in March, 1778, Capt. Henry Billings commander, and left the harbor for the last time in December of the same year. In March, 1779, while cruising in the West Indies, she was captured by the *Venus* frigate, which had formerly belonged to Massachusetts, and was originally called the *Bunker Hill*.

Early in 1779, three privateers lying in New London Harbor, determined to attempt the capture of the brig *Ranger*, a refugee privateer of twelve guns, that infested the Sound, and had taken many prizes, and plundered the coast in some instances. The brig Middletown, and sloops Beaver and Eagle, under Captains Sage, Havens and Conkling, fell upon her as she lay by the wharf at Sagharbor, cut her out and came back with her in triumph. This was on the thirty-first of January. The next day, the same associated trio made a bold but unsuccessful attack on seven vessels which had put into Sagharbor. In this affair, the Middletown grounded and was abandoned to the enemy.

May 27th, 1779, Capt. Richard McCarty, of New London, in a sloop bound for the West Indies, was wrecked in a snow-storm, on Plum Island, and himself and crew, six persons, all lost.

The *Confederacy*, a continental ship of thirty-two guns, built in the Thames, near Norwich, and equipped at New London, sailed on her first cruise, May 1st, 1779, under Capt. Seth Harding. This ship was popularly said to have been built of tory timber. Most of the wood for her hull was cut in Salem, Conn., on the confiscated estate of Mr. Brown, a royalist; and the trunnels of the ship were from locust trees that grew on land near the harbor's mouth, New London, which had belonged to Capt. Oliver, a former officer of the king's

¹ Capt. Chew was a brave and skillful officer, an emigrant from Virginia to New London, and brother of Joseph Chew, heretofore mentioned. The two brothers, like many others in that day of divisions, took opposite sides in the contest. Joseph Chew had been obliged to leave the place on account of his adherence to the royal cause.

customs. To make up the complement of men for her crew, it was necessary to have recourse to the odious practice of impressment.¹ Able-bodied men were becoming scarce upon the coast, through the constant drain for army and navy. The call for "gentlemen volunteers," which was the customary soothing address of the recruiting officer, had been so frequently reiterated, that it had ceased to be answered with alacrity.²

The privateering business was at no time so active, so daring in exploit, and brilliant in success, as in 1779. Both parties, the patriots and the refugees, pursued it with eager rivalry. Between the 1st of March and 13th of June, nine New York or tory privateers, were captured and brought into New London. One of them, the Lady Erskine, a brig of ten guns, was taken within sight of the harbor, by the sloops Hancock and Beaver, Captains Hinman and Havens, who cut her off from a fleet of twenty-one sail, which was passing toward Rhode Island, under convoy of the Thames frigate of thirty-six guns.

A vivid illustration of the life and bustle which this fitful business created at intervals in the town, is furnished by Green's *Gazette*, of June 3d. In that paper were advertised for sale at auction on the 8th instant, the following prizes: brig Bellona, one hundred and sixty tuns, sixteen guns; schooner Mulberry, seventy tuns; sloop Hunter, ninety; sloop Charlotte, sixty; sloop Lady Erskine, sixty, ten guns—all prizes to the Beaver and Hancock: schooner Sally, fifty tuns, ten guns: sloop Despatch, fifty, eight swivels; schooner Polly, forty—prizes to the American Revenue: also, three other prize sloops, with all their cargoes and tackle.

In the court of admiralty, held at New London a week later than the above, (June 10th,) eighteen prizes were libeled, all taken in the month of May.

The refugee adventurers from New York and Long Island, if less enterprising, were far superior to the Americans in number and re-

1 "Monday night last, about fifty seamen and landsmen were pressed by a gang from the ship Confederacy, now lying in the harbor, and carried on board—a part of them have been since released." Green's *Gazette*, of April 29th.

2 The last advertisement of the Oliver Cromwell, will serve as a specimen of this alluring style:

"The ship Oliver Cromwell, Timothy Parker, commander, ready for a cruise against the enemies of the United Independent States. All gentlemen volunteers that have a mind to make their fortunes, are desired to repair immediately on board said ship in the port of New London, where they will meet good encouragement."

sources. If unsuccessful in one undertaking, they had means to urge forward another. Capt. Samuel Rogers, the most noted privateer-man on that side of the Sound, was three times captured, brought to New London, and confined in jail, between March and October, 1779. It was said that during this summer, forty refugee privateers had their rendezvous in Huntington Bay. In the end, they swept the Sound as with a besom, of every thing American; at the close of the year scarcely a sail was left on the Connecticut coast. Everything in this line was to begin anew at the keel.

The fate of Capt. Edward Conkling was peculiarly heart-rending. Cruising off Point Judith, in the sloop Eagle, he captured and manned six prizes in succession, which left the number of his crew less than that of the prisoners on board. The latter, seizing a favorable opportunity, rose upon their captors, and obtaining command of the vessel, exhibited the most savage ferocity. The brave captain and several of his men were cut down after they had surrendered, and their bodies brutally mangled. Only two boys were spared. This was on the 9th of May. The Eagle, before the close of the month, while preparing for a cruise against her former flag, was destroyed by an accidental explosion in the harbor of New York. "Several persons on board at the time," says the newspaper notice of the event, "lost their lives, and among them the infamous Murphy, who murdered Capt. Conkling."

In October, 1779, three large French ships, the *Jonatas*, *Comte d'Artois*, and *Negresse*, came into the harbor, under jury-masts, with valuable cargoes of West India produce. They had sailed with the usual autumnal fleet of merchantmen from Cape François, for Europe, but on the 15th of September, were dismasted in a violent hurricane, and so much damaged that they bore away for the American coast. By singular good fortune, they escaped the British cruisers, but were obliged to sell their damaged cargoes at a low rate, and to winter at New London. In the *Negresse*, which sailed for France early in May, went passenger Col. John Trumbull, the son of the governor, and since well known as an historical painter. The *Jonatas* was purchased of the French owners, and fitted out by individual enterprise as a private cruiser. She carried twenty-nine guns—twenty-four nines and five fours—and sailed on a cruise June 1st, 1780, under the command of Capt. Hinman.¹

¹ She was called the *Deane*, but must not be confounded with the continental frigate *Deane*, which had previously taken the name of the *Hague*. Cooper's Naval Hist., vol. 2, p. 190.

The extreme severity of the winter of 1779-80, is well known. On the 2d of January, a violent storm commenced; the tide and wind together raised the waves, till they dashed over Beach or Water Street like a flood, filling the lower stories of the houses, and damaging the shipping and goods. To this succeeded about five weeks of extreme cold. The Thames was closed up as far down as the light-house—a sight which the oldest natives do not see more than twice, and seldom but once in their lives. A storm on the 7th of February opened the harbor at the mouth, but opposite the town it remained shut till the second week in March. The day previous, a barbecue had been served upon the Isle of Rocks, midway between New London and Groton; but at night a furious south-east storm broke up the ice, and the next morning a dashing current was running where sleighs had crossed and people had feasted, the day before.¹

The *Putnam* was built on Winthrop's Neck, by Nathaniel Shaw, in 1778. Her armament consisted of twenty nines; Capt. John Harman was her first commander. In the spring of 1779, she was fitted for a six months' cruise under Capt. Nathaniel Saltonstall. After being out three months, and sending in six prizes, she went into Boston Harbor, and was there impressed into the continental service, with her crew and equipments, and sent with the fleet under Commodore Dudley Saltonstall, of the ship *Warren*, against the British post at Penobscot. The issue of that expedition was extremely disastrous. The *Putnam* was one of the vessels driven ashore and burnt to prevent them from falling into the hands of the enemy. The officers and crew fled to the woods and escaped capture.

The frigate *Trumbull*, twenty-eight guns, built by order of Congress at Chatham, in Connecticut River, during the winter of 1779-80, was brought into the Thames to be equipped and to enlist her crew. Capt. James Nicholson was her commander. On the 2d of June, 1780, she had an action with the letter-of-marque *Watt*, thirty-four guns and two hundred and fifty men, which is judged, all things considered, to have been the best contested, the most equally matched,

1 Thomas Mumford, of Groton, was then recently married, and the night before the thaw gave an entertainment, which many guests from New London attended, crossing the river in sleighs. The banquet and dance continuing late, and the storm coming on suddenly and furiously, the party were not able to return as they went; and the next morning the swollen river, full of floating ice, rendered crossing in any way a hazardous attempt. Some of the guests were detained two or three days on that side of the river.

equally well fought, and equally destructive battle during the war. In this engagement, several from New London and its vicinity were among the killed and wounded. Daniel Starr, second lieutenant, Jabez Smith, (of Groton,) lieutenant of marines, died of their wounds. Gideon Chapman went overboard on the maintop and was drowned. Gilbert Saltonstall, captain of marines, Pygan Adams, purser, David Pool and Samuel Hearn, boatswains, were wounded. Three of the midshipmen were of New London—one of these, Capt. Richard Law, who died Dec. 19th, 1845, was the last survivor of the crew.

In concluding this account of naval affairs, it may be observed in general terms, that during the whole war, New London was as a den of serpents to the British—constantly sending out its sloops and schooners, well manned by skillful and daring seamen, to harass the boats and tenders along the shore, or to cut off merchant vessels on the high seas. Rich prizes, in spite of their vigilance, would run into this open port, and if pursuit was apprehended, they might be hurried up to Norwich, entirely out of reach.

The year 1777 forms, indeed, an exception to the universality of this assertion. So great was the vigilance of the British squadron on the coast, that between the summer of 1776 and that of 1778, not a single prize was brought into the harbor of New London.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Expedition of Arnold against New London.—Flight of the inhabitants.—A large portion of the town burnt.—Groton fort taken by storm.—Massacre of Col. Ledyard and the garrison.—Incidents after the departure of the enemy.—Estimate of the loss.—The anniversary celebration.—Groton Monument erected.

ALTHOUGH New London had been repeatedly threatened, no direct attack was made upon the town till near the close of the war in 1781. Gen. Arnold, on his return from a predatory descent upon the coasts of Virginia, was ordered to conduct a similar expedition against his native state. A large quantity of West India goods and European merchandise brought in by various privateers, was at this time collected in New London; the quantity of shipping in port was also very considerable, and among the prizes recently taken, was the *Hannah*, (Capt. Watson,) a rich merchant ship from London bound to New York, which had been captured a little south of Long Island, by Capt. Dudley Saltonstall, of the Minerva privateer. The loss of this ship, whose cargo was said to be the most valuable brought into America during the war, had exasperated the British, and more than any other single circumstance is thought to have led to the expedition. At no other period of the war could they have done so much mischief—at no other had the inhabitants so much to lose.

The expedition was fitted out from New York, the head-quarters of Sir Henry Clinton and the British army. The plan was well conceived. Arnold designed to enter the harbor secretly, in the night, and to destroy the shipping, public offices, stores, merchandise, and the fortifications on both sides of the river, with such expedition as to be able to depart before any considerable force could be collected against him. Candor in judging forbids the supposition that the burning of the town and the massacre at Groton fort, entered into his original design, though at the time, such cruelty of purpose

was charged upon him, and currently believed. As flowing from his measures and taking place under his command, they stand to his account; and this responsibility is heavy enough, without adding to it the criminal forethought.

Late in the evening of the 5th of September, information was received in town that a British fleet was lurking under the shore of Long Island, nearly opposite the mouth of the river. So many false demonstrations of attack had been made during the war, that this intelligence caused but little alarm. No public notice was given of it, and no unusual precautions were taken against surprise; soldiers and citizens alike retired to rest. As soon as it was dark, the hostile fleet got under way, and arriving on the coast at one o'clock, would undoubtedly have accomplished their design and made themselves masters of the town and forts, without opposition, had they not been counteracted by Providence. The wind suddenly shifted to the northward, blowing directly out of the mouth of the river, so that the larger vessels were obliged to stand off, and the transports to beat in.

According to the uniform testimony of eye-witnesses, the British fleet consisted of thirty-two sail of all classes of vessels; and the troops were landed from twenty-four transports—eight hundred on the Groton side, and nine hundred or a thousand on the New London side. Arnold, in his report of the expedition, says:

“At ten o'clock, the troops in two divisions and in four debarkations, were landed, one on each side the harbor, about three miles from New London; that on the Groton side consisting of the 40th and 54th regiments, and the third battalion of New Jersey volunteers, with a detachment of yagers and artillery, were under the command of Lieut. Col. Eyre. The division on the New London side, consisted of the 38th regiment, the loyal Americans, the American Legion, refugees, and a detachment of sixty yagers, who were immediately on their landing, put in motion.”

In the mean time, confused and hasty preparations had been made to receive them. At early dawn the fleet had been discovered, lying off becalmed, but the transports making preparations to beat in to the mouth of the river. Col. Wm. Ledyard was the military commander of the district which comprised the two forts, the harbor, and the towns of New London and Groton. Capt. Adam Shapley commanded at Fort Trumbull and the Town Hill Battery; Capt. William Latham at Fort Griswold. An alarm was immediately fired from Fort Griswold; it consisted of two regular guns at fixed intervals—this was the signal to call in assistance from the neighboring country, while three guns was the signal of rejoicing, to give notice

of a victory or a prize. It was evident that these signals had been communicated to the enemy, for when the two distress guns were fired, one of the large ships in the fleet added a third, so as to alter the import. This stratagem had some influence in retarding the arrival of militia.

In the town, consternation and fright were suddenly let loose. No sooner were the terrible alarm guns heard, than the startled citizens, leaping from their beds, made haste to send away their families and their portable and most valuable goods. Throngs of women and children were dismissed into the fields and woods, some without food, and others with a piece of bread or a biscuit in their hands. Women laden with bags and pillow-cases, or driving a cow before them, with an infant in their arms, or perhaps on horseback with a bed under them, and various utensils dangling at the side ; boys with stockings slung like wallets over their shoulders, containing the money, the papers, and other small valuables of the family ; carts laden with furniture ; dogs and other household animals, looking strange and panic-struck ; pallid faces and trembling limbs—such were the scenes presented on all the roads leading into the country. Many of these groups wandered all day in the woods, and at night found shelter in the scattered farm-houses and barns.

Amid the bustle of these scenes, when each one was laden with what was nearest at hand, or dearest to his heart, one man was seen hastening alone to the burial-ground, with a small coffin under his arm. His child had died the day before, and he could not leave it unburied. In haste and trepidation he threw up the mold, and deposited his precious burden ; then covering it quickly, and setting up a stone to mark the place, he hurried away, to secure other beloved ones from a more cruel spoiler.

Such was the confusion of the scene, that families, in many cases, were scattered upon different roads ; and children, eight or ten years of age, were sent off alone into the country, their parents lingering perhaps to bury or conceal some of their effects. Yet no one was lost, no one was hurt. The farm-houses were full, and unbounded hospitality was shown by their occupants. At Gen. Miller's, a little off from the Norwich road, orders were given to open the dairy and the larder, to prepare food constantly, and to feed every body that came. When the house was overflowing, the servants carried out milk, cheese and bread, or porringer of corn-beans to the children, who sat under the trees and ate. This will serve as an example of the general hospitality. A number of families found shelter among

friends and relatives in the North Parish. Groups of fugitives gathered on the high hills afar off, watching with intense interest the movements of the enemy, whose course might be traced by their gleaming arms and scarlet coats, until clouds of smoke hid them from their view.

Some sick persons were removed from town with great difficulty, and at the hazard of their lives; others who could not be removed, were guarded with solicitous care by wife, daughter or mother, who resolved to remain with them, and depend on Providence to soften the heart of the foe, and protect them from danger.

Col. Ledyard, having visited the town and Fort Trumbull, and made the best disposition of what force he could find, and having dispatched expresses to Governor Trumbull at Lebanon, and to commanders of militia in the neighborhood, returned to Fort Griswold.

As he stepped into the boat to cross the ferry, he said to some friends whose hands he pressed at parting, in a firm tone:

“If I must lose to-day, honor or life, you who know me, can tell which it will be.”

The garrisons under Col. Ledyard were small; barely sufficient to keep the posts in order; and in cases of emergency they depended on volunteers from the neighborhood, or details of militia. These were now coming in, and the commander confidently anticipated the arrival of sufficient aid to warrant a defense.

In the mean time great efforts were made to secure the shipping in the harbor, by getting it up the river, but at first neither wind nor tide favored the attempt. Toward noon, however, before the enemy had got possession of the town, a favorable breeze came in from the water, and a considerable number of vessels escaped. The warehouses were full of merchandise, only a small proportion of which could be sent off. Shaw’s warehouse on Water Street, in particular, was packed with goods, and among them was the rich cargo of the Hannah. A sloop load of these were saved.¹

Such confusion reigned in the town—every householder being engaged in the care of his family and effects—that it was difficult to

¹ Mr. Shaw was himself absent from town at the time of the invasion. This was very much deplored at the time. He had gone out on a fishing excursion toward Montauk Point, and after discovering the fleet and its destination, could not get in before them, but was obliged to run into Pequonnuck Creek to escape capture. Dr. Simon Wolcott was with him.

form any concerted plan of action. But when the women and children had departed, the men began to gather in groups, and consult respecting the course to be pursued. They could muster but few effective men, and flight and concealment seemed the only prudent course for them to adopt. But about one hundred, hastily armed, and indignant at the thought of abandoning their homesteads without a blow, collected on Town Hill, with a view of obstructing the course of the enemy. They were without a commander, and as the advancing files of regular soldiers, in firm array, with glistening steel, appeared in sight, they saw the rashness of their design, and scattering into the fields, concealed themselves behind rocks and fences, and annoyed the troops whenever they could find a chance.

Arnold had debarked his forces a little west of the light-house, and came up in a straight course, through what is called Brown's Gate, into the Town Hill road. The division under his command, as already stated, consisted of the thirty-eighth British regiment,¹ and the regiment of loyal Americans, (Col. Beverly Robinson's,) with several companies from other refugee regiments, among whom were one hundred and twenty New Jersey loyalists, under the command of Lieut Col. Upham, and a band of sixty yagers, (Hessian light-infantry.)

"The armed vessels Association and Colonel Martin, went close into the shore, and covered the landing on the New London side." (Upham's Report.)

When the troops arrived at the cross-road, leading down to the shore, which Arnold says was at 11 o'clock, Capt. Millett, of the thirty-eighth, with four companies, was detached to march that way and attack the fort, and at the foot of this cross-road, he was joined by Capt. Frink with a company of refugees, who had marched up by a different route, nearer the shore.

Fort Trumbull was a work of very little strength; a mere block of batteries facing the water on three sides; open behind, and only designed to act against a naval force. Capt. Shapley had with him twenty-three men; and his orders were in case of a direct attack, to retreat to Fort Griswold. He saluted the invaders with one volley, well discharged, and then, having spiked the guns, retreated to the shore, where he embarked his men in three boats to cross the river.

¹ This was Sir Robert Pigot's regiment, but it is not known whether he was with the expedition. The uniform was red, faced with yellow.

² These wore a dark uniform, with bright red trimmings.

The enemy's fleet was so near, that they reached and over-shot them with their muskets ; seven men were wounded, and one of the boats captured.

In the mean time, Gen. Arnold, pressing forward with the main body of troops, arrived at the breastwork of earth and sods, whose insignificance had obtained for it the name of Fort Nonsense, but of which in his dispatch, he speaks with great exaggeration, as a redoubt that kept up a brisk fire upon them for some time, but was evacuated at their approach. "In it," he says, "we found six pieces of cannon mounted, and two dismounted."¹ On this commanding height Arnold paused to survey the scene on which he was about to operate—a scene familiar to his eyes in early life—with houses and shops compact, and sails spread in the offing, all indicative of thrift, enterprise and comfort ; but which he was now, with sword and fire-brand, about to scathe and blacken. His thoughts, however, were intent on the present object, and not discoursing with the past or future. He observes in his report :

"I had the pleasure to see Capt. Millett march into Fort Trumbull, under a shower of grape-shot from a number of cannon which the enemy had turned upon him, and by the sudden attack and determined bravery of the troops, the fort was carried with only the loss of four or five men killed and wounded."

So well it sounds in official language, for five companies of fresh, well-armed British soldiers, to drive twenty-three Americans from an open, defenseless fortress !

It was from this point that Arnold despatched an order to Lieut. Col. Eyre, who had landed on the Groton side, to attack the fort as soon as possible, in order to prevent the escape of the shipping up the river. The general continues :

"No time on my part was lost in gaining the town of New London. We were opposed by a small body of the enemy with one field-piece, who were so hard pressed, that they were obliged to leave the piece, which being iron, was spiked and lost."

This field-piece, which figures thus largely in the report, was a four or six-pounder, which stood on the common, upon Manwaring's Hill, where it had been used for rejoicings, trainings and alarms. It was not at this time manned, but some three or four resolute persons discharged it several times upon the advancing foe, as they came down

1 Iron pieces, four and six-pounders.

Town Hill, and then fled. A detachment of the British was sent up Blackhall Street, to silence this solitary gun, which in truth they effected, but were much annoyed by random shot from behind the rocks and fences. Manwaring's house was then the only dwelling in that quarter. This they ransacked, and having wantonly destroyed some of the furniture, set fire to it, by leaving heaps of burning brands and combustibles upon the floor. One of the town's people entering the house soon after they left it, extinguished the flames with a barrel of soap. When the owner returned to his house that night, he found lying on one of the beds a dying British soldier, piteously calling for water. He had been left for dead by his comrades on the road-side, and being found by some of the returning citizens, weltering in his blood, they had carried him into the house. He lived several hours, and was able to give his name, and to request that intelligence might be sent to his parents of his death. He was about eighteen years of age, a refugee, and the son of refugees then in Nova Scotia. He was interred in a corner of the lot on the opposite side of the street: two or three other soldiers found dead on the hill, were buried on the side of the road in Williams Street.

Lieut. Col. Upham, who commanded the New Jersey loyalists, says in his report to Gov. Franklin :

" We proceeded to the town of New London, constantly skirmishing with rebels, who fled from hill to hill, and stone-fences which intersected the country at small distances. Having reached the southerly part of the town, the general requested me to take possession of the hill north of the meeting-house, where the rebels had collected, and which they seemed resolved to hold. We made a circle to the left, and soon gained the ground in contest. Here we had one man killed and one wounded. This height being the outpost, was left to us and the yagers. Here we remained exposed to a constant fire from the rebels on the neighboring hills, and from the fort on the Groton side, until the last was carried by the British troops."

Col. Upham's party defiled through Cape Ann Street and Lewis Lane, and a flanking-guard set fire to the house of Pickett Latimer,¹ on the old Colchester road, now Vauxhall Street. This house was full of goods, hastily deposited there by the inhabitants for safe-keeping; the distance from the town leading them to suppose that it would not be visited. It was, however, the first building consumed. The main body came on through Vauxhall Street, and at their approach the group of half-armed citizens that had collected on the

¹ Nearly opposite the residence of Thomas Fitch.

beautiful height above the old burial-ground, after a few discharges retired, scattering to other hills and wood-lands, where unseen they could watch the motions of the enemy. It was about noon, when Col. Upham, with the refugees and Hessians, took possession of the hill, and planted the field-piece which they had brought from Fort Nonsense, directing its fire against the shipping, which had been obliged to anchor above the town. But a change of wind and tide operating in favor of the vessels, they spread their sails and escaped up the river. One of the cannon-balls sent after them, went through the front door of a house on the Norwich road, just above the mill, since known as Capt. Robert Hallam's.

Arnold made his arrangements to enter at both ends of the town, to follow the line of the water-side, and complete the work of destruction at the center. He appears himself to have accompanied the party that gained the north end of the town, (probably through Hempstead Street,) under cover of Col. Upham's advanced post. He mentions in his report that he ascended a height of ground in the rear of the town, from whence he had a good prospect of Fort Griswold, and of the shipping that was endeavoring to escape up the river. Two or three persons, inhabitants of the town, who were secreted in the vicinity and who were well acquainted with the person of Arnold, saw him as he sat on horseback, above the meeting-house, with a small spy-glass in his hand surveying the scene, and pointing out objects to an officer by his side, probably Lord Dalrymple, who acted as his aid in this expedition. They turned their horses down Richards Street, through which a part of their force had preceded them.

At the north end of the town the torch of destruction was first lighted at the printing-office, and the town mill. From thence a detachment of the enemy went on to Winthrop's Neck, and set fire to the Plumb house, scouring the whole point, destroying the battery, shipping, warehouses, and every species of combustible property on that side, except the Merrill house, which escaped. On Main Street south of the printing-office, a considerable number of old family homesteads were consumed. The most valuable was that of Gen. Gurdon Saltonstall. The house of Capt. Guy Richards at the foot of Richards Street was marked out for destruction, but a daughter of Capt. Richards lying ill at the time, the English officer listened to the supplications of those who attended upon her, and spared the house. It was an act too barbarous, even for incursive hostility, the most barbarous kind of war, to set fire to a house over the heads of sick and helpless females.

On the east side of the street several private houses, with the custom-house and collector's dwelling near it, various shops of merchandise, mechanic shops and warehouses, with all the wharfing, boating and lumber, were involved in a long line of destruction. Below Hallam's corner in this street no buildings were burnt. At this point the main body of the enemy turned toward Beach or Water Street, where several noted warehouses and shops were situated, and a part of the shipping lay. It is said that Arnold himself with extended sword, pointed out the way to the troops with this emphatic command—"Soldiers! do your duty."

Of course vengeance and destruction had no check: shops, stores, dwellings, piles of lumber, wharves, boats, rigging, and vessels, were soon enveloped in smoke and flame. Hogsheads were knocked in; sugar and coffee lay in heaps, and rum and Irish butter melted in the fire, trickled along the street, and filled the gutters. The prize ship *Hannah*, partly unladen, lay at Shaw's wharf. When burnt nearly to the water's edge she drifted away and sunk near the end of Winthrop's Neck.¹

Bradley Street containing eight or ten houses, was left unharmed. When the regulars came to this street, their guide, one of those "friends to government in the town," whom Arnold mentions as aiding and furnishing information, said to the leader of the party—"In this street there are no shops, no stores—it is the Widow's Row." The words were literally true, and the humane officer commanded his men not to enter the street.

On the Parade all was destroyed. The market wharf, the old magazine and battery, the court-house, jail and jail-house, the Episcopal church, and several contiguous shops and dwelling-houses, were soon a heap of ashes. The western part of this street was left unhurt. The ancient, dilapidated building still extant near the corner of Green Street was then, as it since has been, a well-known tavern stand. The landlady, like many other American women in those disastrous times, had her nearest friends arrayed on opposite sides. Her husband as sergeant in the militia, was at his post in the field annoying the invaders, and her brother was one of those invaders—an officer under Arnold's command. Before mounting her horse to escape, she had her table spread, and furnished bountifully with provisions. Though fleeing with her patriot husband she could

1 The old hull of the *Hannah* was dragged out in 1815, by Amasa Miller, to whose ship-yard it was an obstruction.

not refrain from leaving a dinner for her tory brother. That officer eagerly sought the threshold of his relative, and though he found her not, refreshed himself and his brother officers with the collation. After the close of the war, this refugee captain, being in declining health, obtained leave to return home, and died in the same house.

The enemy, however, did not in general spare the dwellings of their reputed friends. This, instead of being a favor, would have marked them out for patriot vengeance. Arnold himself took some refreshment that day at the house of an old acquaintance in Bank Street, but even before they rose from the table the building was in flames over them. It has been often stated that some whose property was destroyed, received in the end double compensation; that is, from the British on account of their loyalty, and from Congress, in the grant of fire lands by which reparation was made to the sufferers. Arnold was born within fourteen miles of New London, and had lived so long in the vicinity that he had many old acquaintances in town; some of these it was well known had held secret intercourse with him, and officiated as counselors and guides in this expedition.

At the south end of the town the ravage was coincident with the destruction at the north. All the boats and fishing craft around the coves were burnt. A house and shop belonging to a person who held a commission in the garrison of the fort, were singled out and burnt, showing that the guides of the enemy were familiar with the locality. An old fisherman ventured from his hiding-place and pathetically entreated them to leave him his boat; but he was told that their orders allowed of no exceptions and must be obeyed. A woman living near the water on the point, (Shaw's Neck,) seeing a company of the red coats approaching, concealed her well-grown boys in the cellar, and gathering her little children around her went out to meet them. Dropping on her knees before the captain, she told him that her husband had been gone several long years, and she knew not what had become of him; she had nothing left but a group of helpless children and yonder house with its simple furniture, which she entreated him not to destroy. The officer raised her from the ground, and brushing a tear from his eye, said, "Go in, good woman! you and your property are safe; none of my men shall disturb you."¹

¹ The story of this woman was literally true: we are tempted to continue the tale. Her husband was a sea-captain and trader, who being in Europe when the war broke

Very little havoc was made in this part of the town until the enemy came to Bank Street. Here the work of destruction was commenced at the stone dwelling-house of the Shaw family, in different parts of which ignited combustibles were placed, and left to do their work; but after the troops had passed on, a near neighbor who had remained concealed in the vicinity, entered the house and extinguished the fires. An ancient dwelling-house of wood, adjoining the stone mansion, and used by Shaw as an office and store-house, was burnt to the ground, and in it a chest of valuable papers was consumed. The flame from this building caught the roof of the stone house, but was extinguished by the same adventurous neighbor that quenched the fires within the house. Finding a pipe of vinegar in the garret, he knocked in the head and dipping from this fountain poured the convenient liquid from the scuttle, down the roof, till the fire was subdued. By this timely exertion, not only this house but the houses below it, which would probably have been involved in its destruction, escaped.

In this part of the harbor were the spar and ship-yards and a considerable number of unemployed vessels, which were all given to the flames. Old hulls half sunk in the water, or grounded on the flats here and there, are remembered by persons who were then children, as having been left for years afterward lying about the shores. A privateer sloop, fitted for a cruise and in fine order, that lay swinging from a cable fastened to a ring in the projecting rock where is now Brown's wharf, was set on fire, and her cable burning off, she drifted across the harbor, a mass of flame. Through the whole of Bank Street, where were some of the best mercantile stands and the most valuable dwelling-houses in the town, the torch of vengeance made a clean sweep. No building of any importance was left on either side of the street; all combustible property of every description was consumed. This entire devastation was in part owing to circumstances not entering into the plans of the enemy, though it might have been

out, and meeting with reverses and difficulties, had continued there, trading and waiting for an opportunity to return home. The very day Arnold was burning New London he arrived with his vessel in the Sound, and discovering the hostile fleet in season put back and lay close, till the next day. When the enemy had departed, he slipped into the harbor in the dusk of evening, and landing made his way through the smoldering streets to his own threshold; where lifting the latch, he paused, and before speaking to wife or children, fixed his eyes on two ancient portraits of his ancestors, hanging upon the wall, and with a humor peculiar to his character, saluted them and expressed his satisfaction at finding them still on duty, at their post.

anticipated, as a natural consequence of their measures. Several of the stores in this and other parts of the town contained gunpowder in large quantities, which exploding, shook the whole country round, and scattered the flames in every direction.

The general says in his report: "The explosion of the powder and the change of wind, soon after the stores were fired, communicated the flames to part of the town, which was, notwithstanding every effort to prevent it, unfortunately destroyed." Sir Henry Clinton also, in his official letter to England, expresses his concern that the town was burnt, but says it was unavoidable, and occasioned by the explosion of gunpowder.

It ought to be stated as a general fact that Arnold's orders appear to have been given with some reference to humanity and the laws of civilized warfare. Private houses were to be spared, unless in some few instances where the owners were particularly obnoxious. It was afterward well understood that most of the spoil and havoc in private houses was the work of a few worthless vagrants of the town, who prowled in the wake of the invaders, hoping in the general confusion not to be detected. The English soldiers were expressly forbidden to plunder, or to molest the helpless.¹ In several cases where females courageously remained to protect their dwellings, they were treated with marked civility and respect. In one instance a soldier having entered a house and forcibly seized some clothing, the woman went to the door and complained to an officer on guard in the street, who not only restored the articles, but chastised the culprit on the spot, for disobeying his orders.

Instances of tender commiseration for the sufferers were also exhibited in various parts of the town. In one house a female had remained with an aged, decrepit father, too infirm to be removed. Seeing so many buildings in flames and expecting her own soon to be kindled, she dragged her parent in his arm-chair to the extremity of the garden, and there stood over him awaiting the result. The officer on guard observing her situation, went up and conversed with her, bidding her banish fear, for her house should not be entered; he would himself watch over its safety.

Yet no one can be certain that an excited soldiery will not transcend their orders, and scenes of distress must be expected in the train

¹ Arnold warmly commends the conduct of Capt. Stapleton who acted as major of brigade, "for his endeavors to prevent plundering and the destruction of private buildings."

of a reckless invasion. An aged and infirm man, living alone, with no one to care for him and convey him to a place of safety, had crept to the back part of his little inclosure, and when the soldiers were marching by, he stood among the bushes, leaning upon his staff, a peaceable looker-on. One of the party, seeing perhaps only a hat and head, and supposing it might be an armed man lurking there to get a favorable aim, raised his musket and shot the old man dead in his garden.

But the work of destruction in New London was a mere sportive sally in comparison with the tragic events that were passing on the opposite side of the river. The division of Lieut. Col. Eyre which landed on that side, consisted of two British regiments and a battalion of New Jersey volunteers, with a detachment of yagers and artillery. The British regiments, however, were the actors in the scenes that followed, for the Jersey troops and artillery, who were under the command of Lieut. Col. Buskirk, being the second debarkation, and getting entangled among the ledges, copses and ravines, did not reach the fort until after the conflict had ceased.¹

The object of Arnold in directing an attack upon Groton fort was to prevent the escape of the shipping up the river, and he imagined it could be very easily taken.

"I had reason to believe (he says) that Fort Griswold was very incomplete, and I was assured by friends to government after my landing that there were only twenty or thirty men in the fort."

When, however, he gained a height of ground from whence he could survey the scene, he found that the works were much more formidable than he expected, that the garrison had been recruited and that the vessels were already too far up the river to be checked by the guns of the fort. The general proceeds:

"I immediately dispatched a boat with an officer to Lieut. Col. Eyre, to countermand my first order to attack the fort, but the officer arrived a few minutes too late. Lieut. Col. Eyre had sent Capt. Beckwith with a flag, to demand a surrender of the fort, which was peremptorily refused, and the attack had commenced."

What momentous import in those *few minutes too late!* Could those few minutes have been recalled, how much human crime and human suffering would have been spared! One of the saddest pages of American history would never have been written!

¹ Arnold's report

"The fort was an oblong square, with bastions at opposite angles, its longest side fronting the river in a north-west and south-east direction. Its walls were of stone, and were ten or twelve feet high on the lower side, and surrounded by a ditch. On the wall were pickets, projecting over twelve feet; above this was a parapet with embrasures, and within a platform for cannon, and a step to mount upon, to shoot over the parapet with small arms. In the south-west bastion was a flag-staff, and in the side near the opposite angle, was the gate, in front of which was a triangular breast-work to protect the gate; and to the right of this was a redoubt, with a three-pounder in it, which was about 120 yards from the gate. Between the fort and the river was another battery, with a covered way, but which could not be used in this attack, as the enemy appeared in a different quarter."¹

The number of men in the fort was about 150;² two-thirds of them farmers, artisans, and other inhabitants of the vicinity, that had just come in with what arms they could seize, to aid the garrison. The British troops were first discovered from the fort as they emerged from the forest, half a mile distant, with ranks broken, and running half bent till they obtained shelter behind the hills and ledges of rock. Col. Eyre formed his men under the lee of a rocky height, 130 yards south-east from the fort, near the present burial-ground. Major Montgomery, with the fortieth regiment, took post a little farther off, protected also by a hill.

It was about noon, just at the time when Arnold, from the hill on the opposite side of the river, was taking a survey of the scene, that Col. Eyre sent a flag to demand the immediate and unconditional surrender of the fort. Such a demand on their first taking a position of attack was an inauspicious and barbarous commencement of the siege. Col. Ledyard summoned a council of war, in which it was decided at once and unanimously, not to surrender. Captains Elijah Avery, Amos Stanton, and John Williams, three brave volunteers from the neighborhood, all unconsciously wrapped in the awful shadow of coming slaughter, were sent to meet the flag and deliver the reply. A second summons from the British, accompanied with the assurance, that *if obliged to storm the works, martial law should be put in force*, was answered in the same decided manner, "We shall not surrender, let the consequences be what they may." This answer was delivered by Capt. Shapley.³

¹ Narrative of Stephen Hempstead.

² Hempstead says 160. Rufus Avery, in his narrative, 155. The Connecticut Gazette, the week after the battle, 120.

³ Stephen Hempstead.

The officers of the fort were not unconscious of the weakness of their works, nor of the surpassing skill and discipline, as well as the great superiority of numbers, about to be brought against them. But they expected reenforcements, and were confident if they could hold out for a few hours, the country would pour out its thousands to their rescue. Col. Nathan Gallup, of the Groton militia, had visited the fort at an early hour of the day, and left it, fully intending to return with what force he could assemble to aid the garrison. At the moment the attack commenced, the gleam of arms might be seen on the distant hills, from men gathering for the fight. But it was not easy to persuade the militia to coop themselves up in stone walls, where they might be hemmed in and butchered by an overwhelming force. Many valiant men, who had shouldered their muskets and hastened forward with full intent to join issue with the enemy, hesitated when they saw the situation of affairs. Capt. Stanton, who was sent out to draw in volunteers, just before the attack commenced, was met on every side with an urgent appeal for the garrison to quit the fort, one and all, and come out and meet the enemy on the open ground. "We will fight," they said, "to the last gasp if we can have fair play, but we will not throw away our lives, by fighting against such odds, with no chance to escape." Col. Gallup was afterward severely censured for not attempting to relieve the garrison, but a court-martial having investigated the charges, exonerated him from blame, and it is therefore manifestly unjust that dishonorable imputations should sully the name of an otherwise estimable officer.

No sooner was the second defiance returned to the summons than both divisions of the enemy's force were put in motion, and advanced with a quick step in solid columns. A party of Americans posted in the eastern battery, gave them one discharge, and then retired within the fort. Col. Ledyard ordered his men to reserve their fire until the detachment which came up first had reached the proper distance. When the word was given, an eighteen-pounder, loaded with two bags of grape shot, and directed by Capt. Elias H. Halsey, an experienced naval officer, was opened upon them, and it was supposed that twenty men fell to the ground, killed or wounded by that first discharge. "It cleared," said an eye-witness, "a wide space in their column."¹ Their line being broken, they divided and scattered; and now all the fields were covered with scarlet-coated soldiers, with trailed arms, and in every variety of posture, bending, prostrate,

¹ Capt. Rufus Avery.

dropping, half-up, rushing forward, and still keeping a kind of order, as goaded on by their officers, in the face of a deadly fire, they came up against the south-west bastion, and the south and west sides of the fort. They were met with a steady, quick, obstinate fire ; Col. Eyre, mortally wounded, was borne from the field ; three other officers of the fifty-fourth regiment fell.¹ Major Montgomery, in the mean time, came up in solid column, bearing round toward the north with his division, and threw himself into the redoubt, east of the fort, which had been abandoned.² From thence rushing down with great fury, he effected a lodgment in the ditch, and a second lodgment upon the rampart, or fraising, which was defended by strong inclined pickets, that could with difficulty be forced out or broken, and was so high that the soldiers could not ascend without assisting each other.³ The vigor of the attack, and the firmness of the defense, were both admirable. The Americans, having no better method of opposing them, poured down cold shot, nine-pounders, and every variety of missile, that could be seized, upon the heads of the assailants.⁴ Many a bold man was cut down as he was hoisted up through the pickets, but his place was instantly supplied by another as desperate and determined. The assailants conquered by numbers. Arnold, in his report, notices this obstinate contest :

" Here the coolness and bravery of the troops were very conspicuous, as the first who ascended the fraise were obliged to silence a nine-pounder which enfiladed the place on which they stood, until a sufficient body had collected to enter the works, which was done with fixed bayonets, through the embrasures, where they were opposed with great obstinacy by the garrison, with long spears. On this occasion I have to regret the loss of Major Montgomery, who was killed by a spear in entering the enemy's works; also of Ensign Whitlock, of the forty-first regiment, who was killed in the attack. Three other officers of the same regiment were wounded."

When Major Montgomery fell,⁵ his followers, with terrific cries, rushed in to avenge him. One after another they poured in through

1 Arnold.

2 Avery.

3 Arnold.

4 Samuel Edgecombe, a stout, lion-hearted man, who survived the battle, stated that they threw down cold shot like a shower of hail, upon the assailants, but it scarcely checked them a moment, so furious was their onset. Joseph Woodmancy, another of the garrison, stood at his post with such cool concentration of purpose that he kept count while he loaded and fired eighteen times.

5 It has been stated that Jordan Freeman, a colored man, was the person who confronted and killed Montgomery. Hempstead's account gives the credit to Capt. Shapley, but the latter was engaged on the other side of the fort.

the embrasures, and clearing the path before them, made a desperate attempt to force open the nearest gate. This was not accomplished without a struggle. The first man who attempted it, lost his life in a moment.¹ But the garrison was soon overpowered, the gate opened, and the troops from without rushed in, swinging their caps and shouting like madmen.

All the accounts of the battle given by Americans who were in the fort, agree, that at this point, the north-east bastion being carried, the enemy within the fort, and the gate forced, Col. Ledyard ordered all resistance to cease, and the garrison to throw down their arms. This was immediately done, but it had no influence in checking the rage of the enemy. They continued to fire from the parapets upon the disarmed men, and to hew down all they met, as they crossed the inclosure, to unbolt the southern gate.

In the mean time the resistance was still continued at the southwest bastion, by a few brave men who knew not what had taken place on the opposite side of the fort. Against these the enemy turned the cannon of the north bastion, and giving them two volleys in quick succession, mowed them down like grass. Capt. Shapley and Lieut. Richard Chapman fell at this point. Those who survived retreated within the fort and threw down their arms.

The resistance being thus continued in one quarter after the actual surrender of the fort, gives some color to the excuse which has been offered in palliation of the excesses of the British, that the garrison obstinately persisted in fighting after the surrender. It is said also, that during the attack, an unlucky shot at the flag-staff brought the colors down, and though the flag was instantly remounted on a pike pole, the enemy regarding it as a token of surrender, rushed unguardedly to the gates, expecting them to be opened, and were saluted with a heavy fire. This seeming deception, it is alleged, exasperated the troops, and led to the barbarous massacre that followed the reduction of the fort. No allusion to any such mitigating circumstances is made in the British official accounts of the affair; nor were they pleaded by them in that day. These excuses seem to be after-thoughts, suggested by the difficulty of accounting for that almost insane thirst of blood displayed by the conquerors.

When the south gate was opened, the enemy marched in, firing in platoons upon those who were retreating to the magazine and barrack rooms for safety.² The officer at the head of this division, supposed

1 Avery.

2 Avery, Hempstead and others.

by some to have been Major Bromfield,¹ as the superior command had devolved upon him, cried out, as he entered, "Who commands this fort?" "I did, sir, but you do now," replied Col. Ledyard, raising and lowering his sword, in token of submission, and advancing to present it to him. The ferocious officer received the sword, and plunged it up to the hilt in the owner's bosom; while his attendants rushing upon the falling hero, dispatched him with their bayonets. Capt. Peter Richards, a young man of noble disposition and gallant bearing, who though severely wounded, was standing by Col. Ledyard, leaning on his espontoon, Capt. Youngs Ledyard, the nephew of the commander, and several other brave men, enraged at this barbarous act, and perceiving that no quarter was to be expected from such savage foes, rushed forward to avenge their murdered friend and sell their lives as dearly as possible. They were all cut down; some of them were found afterward pierced with twenty or thirty wounds.

There was no block-house to this fort; the parade was open, and as the British marched in, company after company, they shot or bayoneted every American they saw standing. Three platoons, each of ten or twelve men, fired in succession, into the magazine, amid the confused mass of living men that had fled thither for shelter, the dying and the dead. This fiend-like sport was terminated by the British commander, as soon as he observed it, not on the plea of humanity, but from fear for their own safety, lest the powder deposited in the magazine, or scattered near, might be fired, and they should all be blown up together. An explosion, it was thought, might have taken place even earlier than this, had not the scattered powder and every thing around been saturated with human blood.

In the barrack rooms, and other parts of the fort, the butchery still went on. Those who were killed, seemed to have been killed three or four times over, by the havoc made of them. A few of the garrison crept under the platforms to conceal themselves, but were ferreted out with bayonets thrust into them; several had their hands mangled by endeavoring to ward off the steel from their faces or bosoms. Some attempted to leap over the parapets, but were mostly arrested and slain. One man, by the name of Mallison, escaped in this way; being tall, stout and active, he leaped from the platform over the parapet, and with another bound cleared the pickets and came down in

¹ Major Bromfield, or Bloomfield, as he is generally called by the Americans, was afterward promoted in the East India service.

the ditch, and though half a dozen muskets were discharged at him, he escaped unhurt.

William Seymour, of Hartford, a nephew of Col. Ledyard, who being in Groton at the time, had gone into the fort as a volunteer, received thirteen bayonet wounds, after his knee had been shattered by a ball.¹ Ensign Woodmancy was gashed in his arms and hands with strokes of a cutlass, as he lay wounded and partly sheltered by a platform. Lieut. Parke Avery, after having lost an eye, and had his skull broken, and some of the brains shot out, was bayoneted in the side, as he lay faint and bleeding on the ground. What is very surprising, he recovered and lived forty years afterward. Lieut. Stephen Hempstead had his left arm and several of his ribs broken, and a severe bayonet wound in his side. It was eleven months before he recovered.

Some of the British officers at length exerted themselves to restrain the excited soldiery, and stop the massacre. The surviving Americans used to relate that an officer ran from place to place with a drawn sword in his hand, exclaiming with agony in his countenance, "Stop! stop! in the name of heaven, I say, stop! my soul can't bear it." Some have supposed this to have been Capt. Beckwith, while others have branded that officer as the murderer of Ledyard.² It is well, perhaps, that the person who committed that barbarous deed has not been ascertained with certainty. Let him forever remain unknown and unnamed.

Light and darkness are not more opposed to each other than the views taken by the conquerors and the conquered, of the storming of Fort Griswold. Arnold observes:

"After a most obstinate defense of near forty minutes the fort was carried by the superior bravery and perseverance of the assailants."

He says also that eighty-five men *were found* dead in the fort, and sixty wounded, most of them mortally; intimating by this word *found*, that they were killed in the attack, and not after the surrender. Sir

1 This is stated in Hempstead's narrative.

2 Capt. Beckwith acted as aid to Lieut.-Col. Eyre, and after the death of the latter, led on his men to a bold charge upon the fort, being one of the first officers that entered the works. He was afterward promoted in the king's service, and was at one time appointed governor of Barbadoes. On his way to this government, he landed in New York, and while there was announced in the public papers as the murderer of Ledyard. Capt. Beckwith indignantly denied the charge, and a relative of Ledyard having opened a correspondence with him, he submitted to him certain documents and proofs that entirely exculpated him from any share in the massacre.

Henry Clinton, in his dispatch to England, inclosing Arnold's report, remarks :

" The assault of Fort Griswold, which is represented as a work of very great strength, and the carrying it by coup de main, notwithstanding the very obstinate resistance of the garrison, will impress the enemy with every apprehension of the ardor of British troops, and will hereafter be remembered with the greatest honor to the fortieth and fifty-fourth regiments, and their leaders, to whose share the attack fell."

The closing scenes of the tragedy were in keeping with the other acts. The prisoners, the wounded and the dead, were all alike plundered by the soldiers, till they were left nearly naked. The wounded lay in the hot sun without water, without medical care, without covering, for two or three hours. The British were busily engaged in taking care of their own dead and wounded, and disposing of the plunder.¹ Col. Eyre, and all the other wounded men, were carried on board the transports. Major Montgomery was interred in the space fronting the gate, not very far from the spot where he fell. Several other officers were buried near him. About forty of their common soldiery were hastily thrown into pits, several together, and scarcely covered with earth.

Of the garrison, eighty-five, who were entirely dead, were stripped and left in the fort. Those who were regarded as mortally or very dangerously wounded, about thirty-five in number, were paroled, to be left behind ; thirty others, most of them wounded, were marched down to the landing to be carried away as prisoners.²

The last thing to be done by the enemy was to set fire to the magazine and blow up the fort. Preparatory to this, the helpless Americans must be removed. Every thing was done in the greatest possible haste—the movements of the enemy show fear and trepidation, as if afraid the hills would fall on them before they could finish their task and get away. The soldiers ran, rather than walked, hundreds

1 William Seymour was the only one of the garrison whose wounds were dressed by a British surgeon. He owed this courtesy to Capt. Beckwith, with whom he had previously some acquaintance, having met him in New York, when sent thither to negotiate an exchange of prisoners. Seymour was a son of Col. Thomas Seymour, of Hartford, and uncle of T. H. Seymour, the present governor of Connecticut.

2 Of this number was Capt. Rufus Avery, then orderly sergeant of the garrison, who wrote the narrative to which reference has been made in the foregoing account. Capt. Elijah Bailey was another of the prisoners, and probably the latest survivor of the garrison. He died August 24th, 1848, aged ninety, having been for the last forty years of his life, postmaster at Groton.

of times up and down that steep declivity, removing their wounded, dragging their plunder, driving their prisoners ; and now the heaps of fainting, neglected men, lying upon the ground, are roughly rolled upon boards and tossed into a large ammunition wagon, one upon another, groaning and bleeding, those below nearly stifled with the weight of those above. About twenty soldiers were then employed to drag this wagon down the hill, to a safe distance from the expected explosion. From the brow of the ridge on which the fort stood, to the brink of the river, was a rapid descent of one hundred rods, uninterrupted except by the roughness of the surface, and by scattered rocks, bushes, and stumps of trees. The weight of the wagon after it had begun to move, pressing heavily upon the soldiers, they let go their hold, and darting aside, left it to its own impetus. On it went, with accelerated velocity, surmounting every impediment, till near the foot of the hill, when it came against the trunk of a large apple-tree, with a force that caused it to recoil and sway round. This arrested its course, but gave a sudden access of torture to the sufferers. The violence of the shock is said to have caused instant death to some of them ; others fainted, and two or three were thrown out to the ground.¹ The enemy, after a time, gathered up the bleeding men, and carried them into a house near by, belonging to Ensign Avery, who was himself one of the party in the wagon. The house had been previously set on fire, but they extinguished the flames, and left the wounded men there on parole, taking as hostage for them, Ebenezer Ledyard, brother of the commander of the fort.

The village of Groton consisted of a single street on the bank of the river. The house of Thomas Mumford was singled out and burnt. The enemy plundered and burnt several other dwelling-houses and shops, leaving but a few buildings of any kind standing. About sunset they began to embark on both sides of the river ; a delay of two hours would probably have changed the evacuation into a flight, for the militia were gathering under their officers, and all the roads to the town were full of men and boys, with every kind of armor, from club and pitchfork to musket and spontoon, hurrying to the onset.

A rear-guard was left at Groton fort, with orders after all had

¹ Lieut. Stephen Hempstead, who wrote a brief but interesting narrative of these events, and was himself one of the wounded men in the wagon, says that the shrieks drawn from them by agony, when they rebounded from the tree, were distinctly heard and noticed on the other side of the river, amid all the confusion produced by the sacking and burning of the town.

decamped, to take the necessary measures to blow up the magazine, burn the barracks, and entirely destroy the works, from which all but the mournful heaps of dead had been removed.

Gen. Arnold's report states:

"A very considerable magazine of powder, and barracks to contain 300 men, were found in Fort Griswold, which Capt. Lemoine, of the Royal Artillery, had my positive directions to destroy; an attempt was made by him, but unfortunately failed. He had my orders to make a second attempt; the reasons why it was not done, Capt. Lemoine will have the honor to explain to your Excellency."

It is supposed to have been late in the evening when Capt. Lemoine and his men, having laid a train of powder from the barracks to the magazine, kindled a fire in the barracks, and retreated to the ships. Without doubt Arnold and his officers gazed intently on the fort, as they slowly sailed down the river, expecting every moment the fatal explosion, and were keenly disappointed at the result. No explosion followed, but the failure was not owing to remissness or want of skill in the royal artillerist.

Under cover of the night, a number of Americans had cautiously approached the fort, even before it was evacuated by the conquerors; and as soon as the rear-guard of the enemy had retreated down the hill, and the dip of their oars was heard in the water, they hastened to the gate of the fort. Major Peters, of Norwich, is understood to have first reached the spot. Perceiving the barracks on fire and the train laid, without a moment's hesitation he periled life by entering the gate, and being well acquainted with the interior arrangements, rushed to the pump for water to extinguish the fire. Here he found nothing that would hold water but an old cartridge-box; the spout of the pump likewise had been removed; but notwithstanding these disadvantages, he succeeded in interrupting the communication between the burning barracks and the powder. The heroism of this act can not be too highly applauded.¹ Others were soon on the spot, and the fire was entirely subdued. These adventurous men supposed that the wounded as well as the dead had been left by the enemy

¹ Major Peters held a captain's commission at Roxbury in 1775, and in 1778 was appointed a major in Gen. Tyler's brigade. He served in several campaigns during the war. The exploit noticed in the text, has been attributed to others, but documentary evidence afterward exhibited at the pension office, gives to him the honor of having been the first man who entered the fort after its evacuation by the enemy, and of having had the chief agency in extinguishing the fire.

to be blown into the air, and it was to preserve them from this awful fate that they hazarded their lives by entering the fort. The fire being quenched, they hastened to examine the heaps of human forms that lay around, but found no lingering warmth, no sign to indicate that life yet hovered in the frame, and might be recalled to consciousness. Major Peters easily selected the lifeless remains of his friend Col. Ledyard. His strongly marked features, calm and serene in death, could not be mistaken.

As soon as it was known that the British had re-embarked, all Groton was moved, inquiring for her sons. Women and children assembled before the morning dawn, with torches in their hands, examining the dead and wounded in search of their friends. They passed the light from face to face, but so bloody and mangled were they—their features so distorted with the energy of resistance, or the convulsion of pain, that in many cases the wife could not identify her husband or the mother her son. When a mournful recognition did take place, piteous were the groans and lamentations that succeeded. Forty widows had been made that day, all residing near the scene of action. A woman, searching for her husband among the slain, cleansed the gore from more than thirty faces before she found the remains she sought.

The wounded men, left in that lonely house at the foot of the hill, passed a night of inexpressible pain and anguish. Morning at last came, and gentle forms began to flit before their eyes. To these poor, exhausted men, the females who raised their heads from the bare floor, and held cordials and warm chocolate to their lips, seemed ministering angels sent from another world to their relief.

Dr. Joshua Downer, of Preston, surgeon of the regiment on that side of the river, with his son, came early to the relief of the sufferers, dressing their wounds with skill and tenderness. Two had died during the night, but most of the others finally recovered. Capt. Adam Shapley was an exception ; he languished for five months, enduring great pain from his wounds, and died Feb. 14th, 1782.

Fourteen among the dead, and three among the wounded, bore the title of captain. Captains Elisha Avery and Henry Williams had served in the continental army ; the others bore that rank in the militia, or were commanders of vessels. Of the killed, sixty belonged to Groton and twelve to New London. Eleven bore the name of Avery, six that of Perkins. When Ledyard gave up his sword, few of the garrison had fallen ; at least three-fourths of the killed were sacrificed after the surrender. Among them were several of such

tender age, that they could not be called men. Daniel Williams, of Saybrook, was perhaps the youngest; his gravestone bears an inscription which, though brief and simple, is full of pathetic meaning.

"Fell in the action at Fort Griswold, on Groton Hill, in the fifteenth year of his age."

One boy of sixteen, escaped unhurt. Thomas, son of Lieut. Parke Avery, aged seventeen, was killed fighting by the side of his father. Just before he fell, his father, finding the battle growing hot, turned and said, "Tom, my son, do your duty." "Never fear, father," was the reply, and the next minute he was stretched upon the ground. "Tis in a good cause," said the father, and remained firm at his post.

The loss of the British, according to Arnold's report, was forty-eight killed and one hundred and forty-five wounded. Many of the latter died before they returned to New York, and were buried in the sea, or on the shores of Plum and Gardiner's Islands, near which the fleet anchored.¹ They were eight days absent on the expedition. Some of the British officers estimated that the number of sound men with which they returned, was two hundred and twenty less than that with which they started. On the New London side of the river, the havoc of human life was nearly equal in the British and American ranks; about half a dozen killed and a dozen wounded on each side. A Hessian officer and seven men were taken prisoners by the Americans. A number of the inhabitants of New London and Groton were taken and carried away by the British. They had remained too adventurously to take care of their property, or lingered too long in removing effects, or were suddenly seized by some flanking party. These, together with the captives from Fort Griswold, were treated with great severity; more like cattle than men. On the way to New York, they suffered every indignity that language could impose in the way of scorn, contempt and execration; and being driven into the city with their hands bound, were confined in the noted Sugar-house.

The next morning, at daylight, the fleet of the enemy was seen at

¹ Capt. William Coit, one of the prisoners carried from New London, stated that thirteen died the first night on board the transport he was in, and were let down into the sea while they lay at anchor in Gardiner's Bay. As the number was called out, when they came to thirteen, Capt. Coit, who was on deck, exclaimed, impromptu, "Just one for every state!" The words were scarcely uttered, before the officer on duty, flourishing a weapon over his head, knocked his hat overboard—he was consequently driven into New York bareheaded.

anchor off the mouth of the harbor. They made sail at 8 o'clock, but were in sight an hour or two longer. By this time, the whole surrounding country was in motion.¹ All the militia, all who had friends on the sea-board, all who hated the British, all who were impelled by curiosity, came rushing to the scene of desolation, mingled with the fugitives returning after a dismal night of terror and anxiety, to their forlorn homes. On the heights in view of the town, they paused and gave vent to lamentations and cries of anguish over the smoking ruins.

That the enemy suffered so little annoyance on the New London side, and were allowed to retire unmolested to their ships, has been attributed to the want of an efficient leader to concentrate and direct their force. But even under the ablest commander, no position of attack or defense could have been sustained. What could be effected by a motley assemblage of two hundred citizens, against a compact army of one thousand disciplined soldiers! It was well that no daring leader came forward to germinate and encourage rash attempts, whose only result must have been a duplicate of the slaughter on the other side of the river. A single spark more, to kindle indignation to a flame, and the inhabitants had come rushing down on the enemy to pour out their blood like water.

A single anecdote will suffice to show the spirit of the inhabitants, male and female. A farmer, whose residence was a couple of miles from the town-plot, on hearing the alarm-guns in the morning, started from his bed and made instant preparations to hasten to the scene of action. He secreted his papers, took gun and cartridge-box, bade farewell to his family, and mounted and put spurs to his horse. When about four or five rods from the door, his wife called after him—he turned to receive her last commands—“John! John!” she exclaimed, “*don't get shot in the back!*”

The loss of New London from this predatory visit, can only be given in its main items: sixty-five dwelling-houses were burnt, occupied by ninety-seven families; thirty-one mercantile stores and warehouses, eighteen mechanic's shops, twenty barns, and nine other buildings for public use, including the Episcopal church, court-house, jail, market, custom-house, &c. Nearly all the wharfing of the town

1 The regiment from Norwich, under Col. Zabdiel Rogers, was the first upon the ground. It arrived early in the evening. Wm. Williams, Esq., of Lebanon, rode from Lebanon to New London in three hours, (twenty-three miles,) on horseback. The enemy were just preparing to embark when he arrived.

was destroyed, and all the shipping in port, except sixteen sloops and schooners which escaped up the river.

" Ten or twelve ships were burned, among them three or four armed vessels, and one loaded with naval stores; an immense quantity of European and West India goods were found in the stores—among the former the cargo of the Hannibal, Capt. Watson, from London, lately captured by the enemy, the whole of which was burnt with the stores. Upward of fifty pieces of iron cannon were destroyed in the different works, exclusive of the guns of the ships." (Arnold's report.)

The General Assembly of the state, in 1793, compensated the sufferers in part, by grants of land in the western reservation, belonging to the state, on Lake Erie, which were called, from this circumstance, the fire lands. But this late attempt at recompense, was in most instances nugatory: very few of the real sufferers ever received any benefit from it. The losses of individuals cannot be estimated. Nathaniel Shaw stated his personal loss at more than £12,000 sterling.

On the 15th of May, 1782, Mr. Greene Plumbe, rate-collector, came into the town-meeting, and asked and obtained an abatement on the rate-bill of 1780, stating that a sum of money which he had collected on said bill, was plundered from his house when the British invaded the town, August 6th, 1781. This is the only allusion to the great event on the town records, of a date any where near the time, and in this there is a misstatement of the month, which was sixth of September, not sixth of August.

Ten years after the conflagration, it is referred to again:

" April 15th, 1791.

" Voted, that John Deshon, Esq., is chosen agent for this town, to attend the Committee appointed by the General Assembly to ascertain the losses of the sufferers at the fire in this town in the year 1781."

The probate records are not thus silent. A portion of these records was destroyed, and in consequence, some estates were obliged to be settled anew, and several wills were legalized by the legislature from copies of them which had been made. It is not known where the probate records were lodged, either the part destroyed, or the part saved. It is probable, however, that those preserved were with the town records in Waterford. A note made a few years later by the clerk specifies the particular portion lost:

" On the 6th of Sept., 1781, were burnt the records of wills, &c., from the beginning—files since the year 1777, and journals from April 1763; so that there are remaining before Sept. 6th, 1781, the Journals from the first to the 22d of

April, 1763, and files from the beginning to the year 1777 inclusive—unless scattering ones missing.

“Certified Jan. 28th, 1788, Joshua Coit, Clerk of the Probate District of New London.”

The anniversary of the massacre at Groton fort was celebrated for many years with sad solemnity. Within the inclosure of the old wall of the fortress, where the victims had been heaped up and the blood flowed around in rivulets, sermons were annually preached and all the details of the terrible event rehearsed. In 1784 the preacher was Rev. Solomon Morgan of Canterbury; in 1785, Rev. Samuel Nott of Norwich; (that part of Norwich which is now Franklin, where the preacher died May 26th, 1852, aged ninety-eight years and four months;) and in 1786, Rev. Paul Parke of Preston.

In the year 1789, Rev. Henry Channing of New London delivered the annual sermon. His text was—“If thine enemy hunger, give him bread to eat; if he thirst, give him drink.” Unlike the usual tone of such discourses, which had served to keep alive the remembrance of the country’s wrongs, the speaker recommended forgiveness, peace and reconciliation. The British were no longer our declared enemies: why cherish this envenomed spirit? The actors in that awful tragedy were passing away to their final award: does it become Christians to follow them with their reproaches to another world? Should they nourish the bitter root of hatred in the heart, and attribute to a whole nation, the crimes of a few exasperated soldiers?

Through the effect of this sermon, or the diversion of public sentiment from some other cause, the celebrations were discontinued for many years. In the course of time, however, a desire became prevalent—not to revive the embittered feeling of Revolutionary days—but to erect some enduring memorial of the heroism and unfortunate end of the Groton victims. A general spontaneous utterance of this wish led to a celebration of the anniversary of the battle day in the year 1825. The orator was Wm. F. Brainerd. A grand military parade and a large assemblage of citizens gave effect to the unanimous sentiment then expressed, that a monument to the memory of the slain should be erected near the scene of the fatal assault. A lottery for the purpose of raising funds was granted by the legislature; the corner-stone laid Sept. 6th, 1826, and the monument completed in 1830. It is built of native rock, quarried not far from the place where it stands; is twenty-six feet square at the base, twelve at the top and 127 feet in height. In the interior a circular flight of 168 steps leads to the platform, from whence a fine view is

obtained, particularly toward the west and south, where lie New London and the river Thames, the Sound and its islands.

On the west side of the monument is engraved a list of the names of the victims, eighty-three in number, and on the south side is the following inscription :

“ This Monument was erected under the patronage of the State of Connecticut, A. D. 1830, and in the 55th year of the Independence of the U. S. A., in memory of the patriots who fell in the massacre at Fort Griswold, near this spot, on the 6th of September, A. D. 1781, when the British under the command of the traitor Benedict Arnold, burnt the towns of New London and Groton, and spread desolation and woe throughout this region.

“ ‘ Zebulon and Napthali were a people that jeopardized their lives unto death in the high places of the field. Judges, 5th chap., 18th ver.’ ”

Since the erection of the monument, the anniversary day has been usually noticed by gatherings on the spot of individuals, and sometimes by prayers and addresses, but not often by a public celebration. Mr. Jonathan Brooks of New London, who died in 1848, took a special interest in this anniversary. For many years before his death, he resorted annually on this day to Groton Height, and whether his auditors were few or many, delivered an address, which was always rendered interesting by graphic pictures and reminiscences connected with the Revolution. On one occasion when he found himself almost without an audience, he exclaimed with sudden fervor “ *attention! universe!* ”

CHAPTER XXXIII.

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE WAR TO THE CLOSE OF THE CENTURY.

Results of war.—Revival of commerce.—Various commanders.—The Lady Strange.—An execution.—Commercial items.—French exiles.—Deaths of seamen.—Yellow fever of 1798.

IT is needless to observe that the moral and religious character of the place had not improved during the long period of conflict and distress. On the contrary, the tendency had been continually downward: all the agencies at work were in favor of misrule and disorder.

There was no regular minister of any sect remaining in New London; the schools were in a great measure broken up; wives were without husbands to provide for them; children without fathers to guide and govern them. Want was in many instances the parent of vice. For eight years the town had been like a great militia garrison; a resort for privateersmen and state and continental vessels; it had been kept in continual alarm, scarcely a day passing in which the sails of the enemy were not in sight, either hovering like birds of prey, ready to pounce upon the property of the inhabitants, or skirting like thunder-clouds the distant horizon, menacing an immediate attack; and at last it had been actually plundered and burnt by the enemy. As a natural result, ignorance, discord, profanity and rowdyism were lamentably prevalent.

The Congregational church on the hill, near where the alms-house now stands, had not been destroyed by the enemy. A clergyman from a neighboring town who preached in it shortly afterward, often reverted, in later days, to the scenes he then witnessed.¹

¹ Rev. Joseph Strong, D. D., of Norwich.

Before the service commenced, there was loud talking and laughing around the house and in the porch, and even in the pews. The whispering and moving about during the service were so annoying that he could scarcely proceed with his duties, and the instant the blessing was pronounced, uproar commenced. The galleries were in a tumult; young people calling to each other from side to side, jesting and laughing; while the boys and girls were pushing, stamping and rushing out with violence. Before he could reach his lodgings, the young lads, and even some men, had gathered into parties and were playing ball or pitching quoits.

The war left the inhabitants poor and exhausted. Some were not able to rebuild their dwellings. Ten or twelve years afterward many an old chimney might be seen, standing amid heaps of rubbish, ruinous and forlorn, mementos of strife and desolation. But peace works rapidly, and is a near ally to prosperity. Trade revived, prospects brightened and the town was soon, in part revivified. The unemployed officers and crews that had manned the state vessels were eager for employment, the privateersmen, became peaceful traders, and by the year 1784, a flourishing commerce was again the characteristic of the place.

Vessels cleared that year, not only for the West India market, but for London, Liverpool, Cadiz and Ireland. The clearances included, however, all vessels from the Connecticut and Thames Rivers. Norwich at that period having suffered less, took the lead of New London in her shipping list. The ship Centurion, the brig Littlejoe, (Capt. Gurdon Bill,) and the Ranger, (Capt. McEwen,) all sailing in 1784 for London, were owned in Norwich.

As incidents worthy of being recorded, it may be stated that Capt. White from this port, made a voyage to Jamaica in 1784, in the brig Zephyr and back again in thirty-seven days; and Capt. Samuel Stillman, in the brig Milley, made three voyages to Jamaica during the year, in which he carried out 122 horses. He came in from the third voyage, Nov. 3d. It was very unusual for a vessel to accomplish more than two West India voyages in a year.

Captains Hinman, Bulkley, Fosdick, and other commanders of armed vessels, casting aside the apparel of war, entered into the mercantile line. Hinman was afterward in the revenue service. He died in 1807, aged seventy-three. Bulkley was in actual sea service, "afloat and ashore," for nearly sixty successive years. He died in 1848, at the age of ninety-five, the oldest seaman of New London—perhaps of any generation. Fosdick, though a seaman, had served

in the army at the siege of Boston in 1775. He was of nearly equal age with John Ledyard of Groton, the noted traveler, and in boyhood they made their first voyage together. Capt. Fosdick died in 1821, aged seventy-one.

Robert Winthrop made voyages from New London to Ireland in 1787 and 1788. He was a son of John Still Winthrop, and born at New London in 1764, but having been placed during the Revolutionary War under the guardianship of English relatives, at the age of fifteen or sixteen he entered the British naval service. On the conclusion of peace he returned, for a few years to his native place, and was connected in business with his brother William, but in 1790 went back to the British service, in which he subsequently rose to the rank of vice-admiral of the blue. He died in Dover, England, in 1832. Richard Law, a coeval and school-mate of Robert Winthrop, entered the American naval service, at the age of fifteen, and was a midshipman on board the ship *Trumbull* in her desperate combat with the British letter of marque *Watt*, June 2d, 1780. Winthrop was a midshipman on board the *Formidable*, which bore the flag of Sir George B. Rodney in the battle of April 12th, 1782. Capt. Law died in 1845, aged nearly eighty-three years.

We may add the names of Daniel Deshon and Jared Starr, as belonging to the list of those who were seamen before and after the war, and continued in the service many years—dying at an advanced age—Deshon in 1826 aged seventy-two; Starr in 1838 aged ninety-one.

On the revival of trade a host of younger mariners launched at once upon the sea, and promotion being rapid when business is brisk, many of them soon took rank as commanders. They had perhaps but little nautical science: they had just learned enough of navigation to be able to ascertain their latitude. At a very early age and with very little training, except familiarity with the sea, they embarked as masters of vessels with life and property, their own and others', dependent on their ability and good fortune. Yet in general, prosperity and success attended them, and long experience, added to their native sagacity, made them at last veterans and princes in seamanship.

Ship-building revived with trade. The ship *Jenny* built for the European service was launched at Groton, opposite New London, Oct. 30th, 1784. Between this period and the year 1800, a large number of sloops and schooners were set afloat from the various

building yards of the place. Vessels of a larger size were also occasionally built, but of this business we have few statistics.

In 1786 a very singular vessel was constructed at Poquetannuck on the river Thames, ten miles from New London, by Jeremiah Halsey. She was double-decked, burden about 150 tuns, and built almost wholly of plank—several courses being laid, crossing each other at right angles. The only timbers in her were the keel, stem and stern-post. She was firm, well-molded, graceful, and on coming down to New London in November, excited very general curiosity. She was called a snow, and named *Lady Strange*, but many people from her lightness called her the *Balloon*. In a storm which occurred Dec. 3d, while she was fitting for sea, she was driven directly over the sandy point of Shaw's Neck, and stranded among the trees of an orchard on Close Cove; but was got off without damage and sailed for Ireland Jan. 19th, 1787. She proved to be a good sea vessel and a fast sailer, and made several voyages from New London, but was afterward owned in Philadelphia. According to a statement published soon after the death of Halsey, the ingenious architect of this vessel, she was examined at Philadelphia when thirty-two years old, and was at that time staunch and sound.

On the 20th of December, 1786, Hannah Occuish was executed in New London for the willful murder of Eunice, daughter of James Bolles. The crime was committed July 21st, 1786. The perpetrator was an Indian girl of Pequot parentage, only twelve years and nine months old; her victim was six years and six months old. The murdered child was found about ten o'clock in the morning, on the Norwich road two or three miles from town. She lay under the wall, from which heavy stones had been thrown down upon her body. On examination it was discovered that her death could not have been the result of accident, and after a day or two, suspicion having rested on Hannah Occuish, who lived with a widow woman near by, she was examined and confessed the crime. It was a case of cruel and malicious murder, growing out of a dispute that occurred in a strawberry field some days before. The fierce young savage, nursing her wrath and watching for an opportunity to take revenge, at length came upon her victim, on her way to school alone, and after coaxing and alluring her into a wood, fell upon her and beat her to death. The only alleviating circumstances in this case were the extreme ignorance and youth of the criminal. These were forcible arguments

but not at that day of sufficient weight to reprieve from execution. The gallows was erected in the rear of the old meeting-house, near the corner of Granite Street. The sermon on the occasion was delivered by the Rev. Henry Channing,¹ from Yale College, who was then preaching as a candidate to the First Congregational Society.

July 2d, 1788, Capt. John Chapman and nine other persons, chiefly emigrants from Ireland, were drowned within twenty rods of the shore of Fisher's Island. The disaster was occasioned by the upsetting of two boats; one of them being deeply laden, was filling with water, and her people all seizing hold of the other, that also filled and sank. Capt. Chapman had just arrived with a company of emigrants, (probably about twenty,) and some of them being sick, he was attempting to land them on the island, where a tent was to be erected, in which they might perform the necessary period of quarantine. Capt. Chapman had served in the Revolutionary War, both in a naval and military capacity. He was a brother of Major James Chapman, who fell at Harlem Heights, in 1776, and of Lieut. Richard Chapman slain in Fort Griswold, in 1781.

Under the state authority, Connecticut was arranged into two custom-house districts; those of New London and New Haven. The first collector appointed for New London, was Gen. Gurdon Saltonstall. In October, 1784, a branch of the office was established in Norwich; Christopher Leffingwell, naval officer. In October, 1785, the same arrangement was made for Stonington; Jonathan Palmer, naval officer. Gen. Saltonstall died September 19th, 1785.²

Elijah Backus, of Norwich, was the next collector. He removed to New London, on receiving the appointment, which he held until the state authority over the customs was merged in that of the general government.

In June or July, 1789, Gen. Jedidiah Huntington was appointed collector of the port, by Congress, and Nathaniel Richards, surveyor and searcher. These were the first appointments under the federal constitution. Previous to this period, no custom-house records are

¹ Printed at New London by Timothy Green, 1786, and entitled, "God admonishing his people of their duty, as parents and masters."

² In Norwich, at the house of his son-in-law, Thomas Mumford. His remains were brought to New London and deposited in the family tomb.

extant. The following estimates are taken from the marine list kept by Thomas Allen, and published in the New London Gazette:

“ Shipping employed in the European and West India trade, sailing from the port of New London, and chiefly owned in this district, from January 1st, 1785, to January 1st, 1786.

Ships, 3,	Schooners, 38,
Brigantines, 84,	Sloops, 90.

Total export of horses and cattle from January 6th, 1785, to January 10th, 1786—8,094.

The same to January 1st, 1787.

Ships, 3,	Schooners, 32,
Snow, 1,	Sloops, 62,
Brigantines, 69,	Coasting vessels not included.

Export of horses and cattle to January 10th, 1787—6,671.

From January 1st, 1788, to January 1st, 1789.

Ships, 4,	Schooners, 38,
Snow, 1,	Sloops, 71.
Brigs, 53,	

Export of cattle, horses and mules—6,366.

To January 1st, 1790.

Ships, 2,	Schooners, 35,
Brigs, 43,	Sloops, 56.

Export of horses and cattle—6,678.

Besides a number that slip over the platform with stock, unnoticed.”¹

Allen’s marine list was esteemed a valuable appendage to Green’s newspaper. He enlivened the dull record of entries and clearances with maxims, witticisms and sudden insertions of extraneous matter which were often grotesque and amusing. This list commenced in 1770. During the Revolutionary War, he kept a public house in Main Street, which was reopened as the City Coffee House, and the marine list renewed January 1st, 1785.² This house was regarded as the center of good living and convivial brotherhood. Here was to be heard the latest news, the freshest anecdote, the keenest repartee; here was served up the earliest and best game of the season, the January salmon, the eighteen pound blackfish, trout, woodcock and wild duck, in advance of every other table. It was then much in vogue for gentlemen of the town to dine together in clubs.

¹ This means out of Connecticut River.

² “ City Coffee House reopened by Thomas Allen, next door to Capt. Joseph Packwood’s, where can be had drink for the thirsty, food for the hungry, lodging for the weary, good stabling for horses. Said Allen has also a supply of choice Madeira, Lisbon and Port wines, for the benefit of the sick and weakly, and good horses to let to merciful riders.” Green’s Gazette.

August 27th, 1788, the list comes out with a cheering announcement:

"Thomas Allen's marine list, commences on a new hope, the Federal Constitution."

Allen died November 19th, 1793.¹ The marine list was next kept by Thomas Pool and Thomas Coit, successively, to the year 1805, when it was taken by Nathaniel Otis, and kept by him to June, 1813; that is, till the second war with Great Britain had deprived the town of all commerce to report.

After the Revolution, foreigners, French and Spanish, occasionally resorted to New London, and a few, finding congenial occupation, remained and became citizens. Louis Maniere, a French Protestant, settled in the town, in 1785. The French government, in 1786, stationed Philip de Jean at the port as a naval agent. He was a gentleman of mature years and discretion, and had been long in the country, having dwelt on the north-western frontier. After remaining in New London for six or eight years, sometimes receiving a salary from his government, and occasionally obliged to supply its place by teaching the French language, he was ordered to Hispaniola, on some business, where he soon fell a victim to tropical pestilence.

The names of Badet, Bocage, Boureau, Constant, Dupignac, Laborde, La Roche, Laurence, Pereau, Poulain, Renouf, designate foreigners who either brought families to the place, or contracted family relations after they came. Descendants of several of these persons are still found here, and others are scattered in various parts of the Union. Other Frenchmen were found for a few years on the roll of inhabitants, and then passed away. Among these were the names of Durivage, Girard, Laboissiere, Mallet, Montenot, Rigault and Rouget.

Some of these were emigrants or exiles from France, but most of them came from the French islands. After the struggle between the races commenced in St. Domingo, New London became a noted resort for the unfortunate, who were driven from their homes by the conflict. From 1794 to 1797, inclusive, almost every vessel from the islands brought passengers, and some were crowded with them.² The hotels and all the small boarding-houses were filled for a season, but

1 He was born in Boston about the year 1728, and married at New London, in 1764, Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Christophers, and relict of John Shackmaple.

2 Among the emigrants who arrived in 1794, was the abbess of a nunnery at Cape St. Francois, who was brought out by Capt. Samuel Hurlbut.

they soon scattered, seeking in other parts of the country, cheaper living, or friends and employment. They were mostly a quiet, cheerful people, with habits of industry and morality.

Many of these emigrants who fled from their homes in times of invasion and insurrection, took no property but what they could carry on their persons, and when this was expended, their case was melancholy in the extreme. One of these unfortunate exiles boarded with a widow, herself with small means; yet she exacted from her lodger only a bare sufficiency to save herself from loss. To requite her kindness, he kept her little garden in order. This occupation, as it engaged his chief attention, and diverted his mind, served him for companion and friend. He paid his stipend to the widow as long as he had money, or any thing that he could convert into money. He parted with every pocket article, and with every extra garment, having made up his mind apparently to live as long as he had any thing left, but to quit life when all was exhausted. That time at length came; he was still cheerful, and paid his landlady with a smile for his last meal. He then went into the garden, and passed from side to side, gazing upon it with seeming delight. Just as the sun went down, he gathered up his implements, saying to each article, the shovel, the rake, and the hoe, as he laid it aside, in a low, sad tone, farewell! farewell! Then turning round, he surveyed the little plot, and raising his hat, bowed toward it a respectful leave, and entered the house. All this was seen and overheard by a fellow-lodger, but its purport was not understood till the next morning, when the unfortunate exile was found dead in his bed, with an empty bottle labeled *laudanum*, by his side.

Laboissiere, a name before mentioned, was an exile from the islands, who brought a small sum of money with him, which enabled him to set up a small shop. After affairs at home were in some degree quieted, he went back, and it was reported by those who carried him out, that on meeting his wife after their long separation, he was so overcome with emotion that he fell dead upon the spot.

About the year 1795, the French republic commissioned John Pinevert to be their vice-consul at the port of New London. This was an acceptable appointment. Mr. Pinevert had resided in the place for nearly twenty years, and was esteemed for suavity and integrity. He was a native of Rochefort, in France, and died in New London, in 1805.

The advancement of morals and religion, unhappily, did not keep pace with the public prosperity. People seemed to think of little except the means of subsistence, the excitements of business and politics, and the pungent enjoyment of life.

All accounts agree in speaking of the *manners* of the inhabitants as belonging to the *free* and *easy* style. Jovial parties of all kinds, hot suppers, tavern dinners, card-playing, shooting matches, and dancing assemblies were popular. Merchants and other citizens congregated around the coffee-houses, told stories, cracked jokes, made the air resonant of laughter, smoked, traded, and complimented each other with brandy, gin sling and old Jamaica, as matters of course every day in the week, Sundays, we regret to say, not wholly excepted. Such were the general characteristics of society, until we pass over the threshold of another century.

After ten or twelve years of great prosperity, reckoning from the peace of 1783, the commerce of the United States was checked by the depredations of belligerent European nations. The West Indies had various claimants; they were the resort of people of many tongues and hues, of royal fleets, of legalized privateers, and of pirates and buccaneers. The American traders were the prey of the whole. Their vessels were subject to all the degrees of molestation, from simple detention and abusive words, through plundering, capturing, libeling, adjudication and condemnation, to entire loss of vessel and cargo, and often, impressment of the crew. New London had her portion of these wrongs. Her seamen also suffered greatly from the pestilential fevers of the tropics. Capt. George Chapman, in one voyage, lost every man on board, but one, of fever. In November, 1795, Capt. Lathrop, in the ship Columbus, fell in with a schooner, bound to Boston, that had only one living man on board; the rest of the crew, five in number, had died after leaving port. He put a couple of his own men on board, who brought her into the Thames.

The Saltonstall family, of New London, was repeatedly thinned by deaths in the West Indies. Capt. Gurdon Saltonstall, (son of Winthrop,) and Thomas B. Saltonstall, died in June, 1795. Capt. Dudley Saltonstall, father of the last named, who had attained the rank of commodore in the continental service, was the victim of the next year. Dr. Winthrop Saltonstall, another of the family, died on the island of Trinidad, in 1802.

Of the same diseases and in the same clime, died also, in 1795 and

1796, Captains Giles Mumford, Howland Powers, John Rogers, Ezra Caulkins, James Deshon, and Samuel B. Hempstead.

In 1798, the ship Sally, Capt. Boswell, of Norwich, lost eight men in one voyage, of yellow fever.

July 2d, 1802, arrived brig Neptune, Bulkley, from Grenada; Capt. Merrills, of Hartford, went out master, and died, with both mates and five hands.

It was calculated that for twenty years, reckoning from 1790, so many from New London went to sea and never returned, being swallowed by the ocean, or cut off by the diseases of the tropics, as sensibly to diminish the population of the place.

Among the captains who perished by marine disasters, were Peter Latimer, in 1790; Robert Crannell, 1792; James Angel, 1794.

The brig Nabby, Capt. Norcott, sailed for the West Indies, July 25th, 1795. She was just rounding Montauk Point, when she began to settle, (probably from the sudden starting of a plank,) and falling upon her larboard side, the water rushed in with such vehemence that Joseph Hurlbut, a young man only twenty-two years of age, but the principal owner of the vessel and cargo, was drowned in the cabin. The others on board barely escaped. They heard the voice of their friend, uttering exclamations of distress, without being able to afford him any assistance. It was supposed that in the lurch of the vessel, he was disabled by a blow, or so entangled by the freight, that he could not extricate himself.

Captains John Manwaring, Oliver Barker, Thomas Crandall, William Briggs, John McCarty, Thomas Rice, Timothy Sparrow, William Weaver, died at sea; Briggs, McCarty and Rice, in 1804; William Packwood, in 1805; William Leeds, in 1806; James Rogers, in 1807; Edward Merrill, in 1809; Charles Hazard, in 1810. Benjamin Richards, a native of New London, but engaged in the European trade, and sailing from New York, died at St. Petersburg, Russia, in 1809. It is probable that no port in the Union, leaving out of view the fishing ports on the eastern coast, has buried so large a proportion of its population in the sea.

It has been often asserted, and is probably correct, that seamen who are not cut off by disasters, and are not given to excesses, are usually favored with a vigorous old age. A few instances may be given of commanders in the old West India trade, who attained an age beyond the appointed span of life.

Daniel Chapman died in 1841, aged eighty; George Chapman, 1846, aged seventy-six; Edward Chappell, 1824, aged eighty; James

Edgerton, 1842, aged eighty-two; Samuel P. Fitch, 1841, aged seventy-six; Michael Melally, 1812, aged seventy-seven; William Skinner, 1803, aged seventy-four. Capt. Joseph Skinner was regarded as a skillful and accomplished seaman; he made many European voyages, sailing often from New York, but sometimes from New London. He died in 1836, aged seventy-two.

1798. This was the year in which that fatal epidemic, the yellow fever, committed such ravages in New London.

"From the 28th of July, to the 1st of September, the heat was intense; the mercury in a northern exposure in the open air, stood at midday from 86° to 93°, with the exception of five days, in which it stood at 82°, and one day at 78°, which was its greatest depression. There was only one thunder-shower during this period. The earth being parched under excessive drought, vegetation failed early in August, and many trees shed their leaves. It was noticed that the air was remarkably unelastic, especially in that part of the city where the desolating sickness prevailed. Scarcely a day occurred for seven weeks, in which a person might not have carried a lighted candle through the streets. The nights, in gloomy succession, brought a deadly calm, attended with sultry heat."¹

"A short account of the yellow fever, as it appeared in New London, in August, September and October, 1798, with a list of those who died by the disease," was published in pamphlet form, by Charles Holt, of the Bee newspaper. From that account, which was compiled with care and accuracy, the following sketch is abridged.

The first alarm was given by the death of Capt. Elijah Bingham, keeper of the Union Coffee House, after an illness of two or three days. The funeral, which was on the same day, (Sunday,) was attended by a concourse of people, and celebrated with masonic pomp. The heat of the weather was extreme; and two days afterward, three other persons in the neighborhood died, and the report now spread with rapidity that the yellow fever was the fatal disease that had swept them away. Many persons removed from the town, or at least from the immediate neighborhood of the disease, and a health committee was appointed, with directions to see that the sick had proper care and attention, that the indigent were relieved, and the dead properly buried. For several days after this, four or five died in a day, and this ratio kept increasing, until the infected district was almost entirely abandoned. It was most virulent in the northern

¹ Rev. Henry Channing, in a newspaper statement.

part of Bank Street, where it first commenced, and was limited in its extent to 100 rods north and south of the market. The fatal day was usually the fourth or fifth from the first attack. The patients had the various symptoms which have so often been described as characteristic of this disease, languor and restlessness, chills and flushes, nausea, extreme pains in the head and back, a scurfy, pealing tongue, a yellow skin, delirium or stupidity, the black vomit, and death. By the 14th of October, the disease had greatly abated, and by the 28th had nearly disappeared. In about eight weeks, 350 had been attacked, of whom eighty-one died.¹ It was remarked that the disease attacked almost indiscriminately all within its reach ; no description of people, no particular habit or constitution, escaped ; large and airy dwellings, wealthy and respectable citizens, were visited with as much severity as the poorest and more crowded families in the neighborhood. Many of those who used the greatest precaution, caught the disease and died ; others who were greatly exposed, escaped. Between the market and Golden Street, on the bank, only two persons over twelve years of age, of the regular inhabitants, escaped the infection, except those who removed on the first appearance of the fever. Mr. William Stewart died at Haughton's, on the Norwich road, seven miles from New London. From the time that the fever commenced, he had used the precaution of sleeping out of town, leaving the place in the afternoon, after his business was concluded. But this was not effectual ; he carried the infection with him, and died September 6th, after less than two days' illness.

Dr. Samuel H. P. Lee was almost the only physician belonging to the town who attended upon the sick. Dr. Rawson was one of those attacked early with the disease ; another of the faculty was confined by sickness, and others deserted the city. "It fell to the lot of Dr. Lee," says Mr. Holt, "alone and unassisted to combat the fury of this dreadful pestilence." He was assisted, however, during a part of the time, by Dr. James Lee, of Lyme, and Dr. Amos Collins, from Westerly. Mr. Gurdon J. Miller, also, though not a practicing physician, administered medical aid to a large number of the sick, and refused all compensation for it. The health committee performed their duties in the most satisfactory and noble manner. Vigilant, cheerful, assiduous, unwearied and impartial, they executed

¹ Several names not in Holt's list were afterward ascertained to have been victims of the fever, making the whole number about ninety. The compact portion of the town then comprised about 2,800 inhabitants.

their difficult and hazardous office until their services were no longer needed. Their names will be found honorably recorded in the following town vote:

"In town meeting, February 4th, 1799, voted that this town entertain a very high sense of the fidelity, benevolence and unwearied exertions of Messrs. John Woodward, John Ingraham, James Baxter, and Ebenezer Holt, Jr., the committee of health during the late epidemic in this town, and that the thanks of this town are cordially tendered to them for their meritorious services. Also that the thanks of this town be presented to Mr. Gurdon J. Miller, for his benevolent medical exertions in behalf of the sick, during the above mentioned period."

A few cases of yellow fever appeared again in the town in 1803, but the disease came from abroad, and did not spread among the citizens.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Death by lightning.—Meeting-house built on Zion's Hill.—Ministry of Rev. Henry Channing.—Of Rev. Abel McEwen.—Granite or McEwen Church built.—Second Congregational Church.—Seabury Church.—Bishop Seabury. Hallam Church built.—Origin of the Methodist Society.—Scenes in 1803.—Division in the Society.—Bethel Church.—First Baptist Church.—Second Baptist.—Huntington Street or Swan Church.—Universalist.—Roman Catholic.

In this chapter the ecclesiastical history of the town will be resumed at the period succeeding the Revolution, and brought down to the present time.

Congregationalists.—After the death of Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge, pastor of the first Congregational church, in 1776, eleven years elapsed before a successor was ordained. Such was the confusion of affairs consequent upon the war, the continual apprehension of an attack, and the ultimate burning of the town, that the society only engaged preachers by the year, month or Sabbath, as opportunity offered. Rev. William Adams preached about half the time, during the first three years. Rev. Emerson Foster occupied the pulpit for fifty-eight Sabbaths, in 1780 and 1781. Rev. Solomon Wolcott, twelve Sabbaths in 1782. Rev. Nathaniel Patten, the whole of 1785, and the first part of 1786. These were the last stated services in the old Saltonstall meeting-house, on the hill. A few occasional sermons were afterward preached on it. Rev. John Murray gave one of his popular discourses from that pulpit, June 21st, 1786. But it is believed that the last sermon in the house, the last on old Meeting-house Hill, was preached by Rev. Rozel Cook, of the North Parish, August 23d, 1786, on occasion of the death of Sally, daughter of Thaddeus Brooks.

This young maiden was killed by lightning, on the day previous, during a tremendous thunder-storm, which lasted three hours. She was in the act of closing a chamber window, in her father's house, in Bradley Street, when the bolt descended upon the chimney, and glancing in various directions, injured the house considerably, threw down Mr. Brooks, who was in one of the lower rooms, and rendered

him for a time insensible, and striking his daughter upon the right temple, ran down her side and produced instant death. Her cheerful, ringing voice, sounding from above, "I am not afraid, mother!" had scarcely ceased, when she lay upon the floor, dead, discolored, deeply scarred by the fire, and her garments half consumed. She was an only daughter, fifteen years of age, amiable and much beloved. The young girls of the town attended her funeral, wearing mourning badges, and moving in sad procession. Mr. Cook's text was from Job, xxxvii. 11-14. A tomb was excavated in the old burial-ground to receive the remains of the youthful victim, and thither for several successive years, all the flowers that bloomed in her flower-garden, were brought by her relatives and laid on her coffin.¹

The pulpit and pews of the old meeting-house had been taken down before this period and sold to the inhabitants of Stonington Point, who were then building their first house of worship, but temporary staging and seats were provided for occasional use.

In the year 1785, two houses of worship were projected and commenced by the two ecclesiastical societies, Congregational and Episcopal. Both were opened for service in 1787, and both have been recently relinquished by their respective societies, (in 1849 and 1850,) after a coincident worship in each, of nearly sixty-three years.

The Congregational society abandoning the old site, selected a position more accessible and central for their new church. After some preliminary measures had been taken, they passed with great unanimity the following votes:

"1st. That the meeting-house shall stand on Bolles' Hill.

"2d. That the pews shall never be the property of individuals, but rented annually, and the proceeds used for keeping it in repair, and supporting a minister."

The spot selected for the site was originally included in the Blatchford or Hill lot, but had been sold before that lot went into the possession of the Ervings, and was then the property of Stephen Bolles.²

¹ It is not ascertained that another instance of death by lightning occurred in New London till July 25th, 1847, when a farm-house near the harbor's mouth was struck, and a son of Ezra M. Keeny, four years of age, standing near the window, was instantly killed.

² The price of Mr. Bolles for the lot was £75, but he threw in £25, as his contribution toward the church.

It was the highest elevation of a granite ledge, offering on its rounded summit a peerless platform for a church.¹

The sum raised by subscription for building the sacred edifice, was £1,267, 12s. 6d. Of this sum, Thomas Shaw gave £400 in labor and lumber. Very few of the subscriptions were in cash; some gave labor, some building materials, board of workmen, dry goods, groceries, &c. The house was built in 1786, and the pews sold at auction January 19th, 1787, for £143, 16s. That part of Union Street which passes by this edifice was opened about the same period. The first preaching in the house was the execution sermon of the Indian girl, Hannah Occuish, December 20th, 1786.

Rev. Henry Channing was ordained pastor of the church May 17th, 1787. He had been a tutor in Yale College, and was recommended to the society by President Stiles, of that institution, who preached the ordination sermon. His salary was fixed at £140 *per annum*. In 1788, by means of a second subscription of £500, the meeting-house was painted and put into complete order.² It was then considered a structure of more than ordinary elegance; the dimensions were seventy feet by fifty, with twenty-eight feet posts. The narrow, high pulpit, was overshadowed by a sound-board of apparently terrific weight, which was sustained by an iron rod, undoubtedly of great strength, but not of sufficient size to dissipate all anxiety from the minds of beholders.

A parsonage or glebe-house and land, with house and land for the use of a sexton, were presented to the society in 1787, by Thomas Shaw. The parsonage was on Main Street, and had once before been ministerial property, being originally a part of the Liveen legacy to the society, but afterward a Latimer homestead. The house was built by Col. Jonathan Latimer, and conveyed by him to his son Capt. Robert Latimer, in 1767. The latter enlarged it to double its original size, but removing afterward to Middletown, sold the place to Shaw, who made a free gift of it to the society. It was occupied for a parsonage about fifty years, but the distance from the church rendering it inconvenient for the pastor, it was relinquished.³

¹ This situation is now familiarly called Zion's Hill, a designation which is believed to have originated at a Sunday-school celebration in 1830.

² Two of the subscribers on this list of 1788 are living in 1852, viz., John Coit, of New London, and George D. Avery, then of New London, but since of Oxford, New York. They were both pew-holders in 1790.

³ The house is still extant, and was sold by the society in 1860, for \$2,300.

Rev. Henry Channing was a native of Newport; graduated at Yale College, in 1781, and was tutor of that institution from 1783 to 1786.¹ A revival of religion in the congregation, followed his settlement at New London. About eighty persons became members of the church within two years after his settlement. His ministry continued nearly nineteen years.

On the 21st of February, 1806, Mr. Channing sent a letter to the society committee, asking for a dismission from his charge. The reasons he assigned were the insufficiency of his salary to meet the enhanced prices of the times, the indifference and neglect with which his complaints on that subject had been treated, forcing upon him the conclusion that his ministerial services were no longer acceptable, and finally, the inefficiency of his labors during the last seven years, to counteract the evidently declining state of religion and morals in the place.

The society concurred with Mr. Channing in calling a council, which convened May 20th, 1806, at the house of Gen. Jedidiah Huntington, and voted a dissolution of the connection.

This measure was an unexpected one, as no obstruction to the regular harmonious intercourse between the pastor and the congregation had taken place. Dignified courtesy on his side, had been met with respectful reserve on theirs. Nevertheless, a disagreement in faith and doctrine existed, which must in the end have led to disruption. Mr. Channing was a Unitarian, perhaps had always been one, but this was not known or suspected at the time of his settlement. It was now no longer a surmise or a secret. His lips had been for some time watched; no admission of the divinity of Christ ever issued from them. The form of covenanting and profession of faith was expressed in vague and general terms; he avoided the customary doxologies, and dismissed all worshiping assemblies with apostolic ascriptions of praise and glory, as in I. Timothy, i. 17. Most of his congregation were aware of his sentiments, though little was said about them. A general indifference in respect to doctrines prevailed.

William Ellery Channing, the nephew of the Rev. Henry, was in the family of his uncle at New London, for a considerable time, pursuing his education under his tuition, and it is probable that he first imbibed from his instructor and relative, those views and doctrines

¹ Mr. Channing married, September 25th, 1787, Sally McCurdy, of Lyme. They had nine children, four of whom died in infancy.

1803

of which he was afterward the eloquent champion. After being licensed to preach, he occasionally occupied the pulpit of his uncle ; and at his ordination in September, 1799, over the church in Federal Street, Boston, the New London church assisted, by invitation, and were represented by their pastor, Rev. Henry Channing, and delegate, Gen. Jedidiah Huntington.

During the nineteen years of Mr. Channing's ministry, the admissions to the church were one hundred and eighty-nine ; baptisms, five hundred and seventy-five, of whom fifty-six were adults, and several by immersion : marriages by him, three hundred and forty-six.

Mr. Channing's services closed in May : on the 14th of July, the society voted to call the Rev. Abel McEwen to the pastoral office. He accepted the invitation, and was ordained October 22d, 1806—sermon by Rev. Timothy Dwight, president of Yale College.

With Mr. McEwen's ministry, Dwight's Psalms and Hymns were introduced, and a new form of church covenant was adopted, expressing the doctrines regarded as orthodox, with distinctness and perspicuity. A session-house was also very soon provided. Before this period all conference meetings, and in general, religious lectures, had been at private houses.

Rev. Abel McEwen, D. D., is a native of Winchester, Ct. He graduated at Yale College in 1804, and has been Socii of that institution since 1826. At the close of this history in 1852, he has nearly completed the forty-sixth year of his ministry. Number of members in his church about two hundred and fifty.

In 1848, the society came to the determination of building a new house of worship, on the site then occupied. As a preparatory measure, therefore, the old house must be removed. The last service in this venerated building, was held Sept. 30th, 1849 : the sermon by the pastor from Psalm cii. 14.



CONGREGATIONAL MEETING-HOUSE.

1786—1850.

This edifice was taken down, and in the course of the year 1850, a granite church—the stone partly quarried from the foundation, and partly from another ledge about one hundred rods distant—was erected on the spot, at a cost of about \$43,000. The architect was Leopold Eiditz, of New York. The main features of the design belong to the most ancient Gothic style; the arches are semi-circular, the recess for the pulpit, semi-octagonal, and the side windows double, with a broad column in the center. The architectural design and proportions of the building, with the open, airy appearance of the campanile or bell-tower, and the light and graceful spire, harmonize well with the elevated position and color of the stone.

A second Congregational church was organized by a colony of nineteen members from the first church, April 28th, 1835. A church had been previously built and dedicated April 23d. Rev. Dr. Baldwin, then of New York, but afterward president of Illinois College, preached the dedication sermon. The cost of the edifice when completed, was about \$13,000; the land for the site was a gift from T. W. Williams.

Rev. Joseph Hurlbut supplied the pulpit for nearly two years.

Rev. James McDonald was installed Dec. 13th, 1837; dismissed, Jan. 7th, 1840.

Rev. Artemas Boies, previously of the Pine Street Church, Boston, was installed March 10th, 1840. He died, after a short illness, Sept. 25th, 1844. He was the first pastor of any denomination, that had deceased in the place, since the death of Bishop Seabury, in 1796.

Rev. Tryon Edwards, previously of Rochester, N. Y., was installed March 6th, 1845.

This church numbers, in 1851, about one hundred male and two hundred female members.

Episcopalians. The Episcopal society assembled for the first time after the burning of the town, April 25th, 1783. William Stewart and Jonathan Starr were chosen church-wardens, both of whom had held the office before the fire. The great and interesting object before them was the erection of a new church; or, as it is expressed in the record, "the reestablishment of our sacred dwelling."

The site of the old church was wanted by the town for the purpose of widening the street or Parade, but the society hesitated to relinquish it on account of the interments that had been made in the ground. All traces of graves, however, had been obliterated by the fire and rubbish of the ruins, and an exchange was ultimately effected with the town, by which the church-lot was thrown into the highway, making a part of State Street, and a new site was procured by the society, on a portion of the old Edgecomb homestead in Main Street, which by the opening of Church Street, simultaneously with the erection of the church, became a corner lot. On this spot the second Church of St. James, which may be called the Seabury church, in distinction from the first, or McSparran church, was erected. Bishop Seabury had become an inhabitant of the town, and the church was commenced and built under the expectation that it would be occupied by him. The foundation stone was laid July 4th, 1785, and the house dedicated by Bishop Seabury, Sept. 20th, 1787. The dome and bell were not added till 1794.

The interments in the old church-yard upon the Parade, had been very few, and those principally of persons belonging to the families of English residents, or recent settlers in the place. Most of the native Episcopal families are known to have been gathered to their

fathers in the ancient burial-ground. At several different periods since the beginning of the present century, human bones have been unearthed by workmen employed in grading State Street; a few only at a time, but indicating that they had struck into one of the graves in the cemetery of the old Church of St. James.

Samuel Seabury, second son of Rev. Samuel Seabury, was born in Groton, Nov. 30th, 1729; graduated at Yale College in 1748, and in 1750 went to Scotland for the purpose of studying the science of medicine; but changing his design and turning his attention to theology, he was ordained in 1753, a minister of the Church of England, and returned to America as a missionary of the "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts." He preached a short time in the province of New Brunswick, from whence, in 1756, he removed to Jamaica, Long Island, and in 1766 was transferred by the society to Westchester, N. Y., where he kept a classical school both for boarders and day scholars, and officiated as rector of the parishes of East and Westchester. He had at the same time considerable practice as a physician. In the Revolutionary contest he was a royalist; and in November, 1775, was arrested at his house by an armed force, carried to New Haven, and kept for some time in durance. He was subsequently released and allowed to return to his family.¹ In 1777, he was appointed chaplain to the "king's American regiment," which was raised in Queen's county, N. Y., by enlistment of royalists.²

In 1784, he went to England, bearing the recommendation and request of a number of Episcopal clergymen in Connecticut and New York, that he might be appointed Bishop of Connecticut. He applied for consecration to Dr. Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury; but that prelate, doubting his authority to consecrate a bishop out of the bounds of the British empire, and requesting time for deliberation, Dr. Seabury, impatient of delay, proceeded to Aberdeen, and made a similar application to the prelates of the Scotch church. He was successful in his suit, received Episcopal consecration, Nov. 14th, 1784, and returned to America as Bishop of Connecticut. In New London, where he had passed his early days, and among the people of St. James' Church, the ancient flock of his father, he found a pleasant and congenial home. His salary was "£80 *per annum*, half the contribution," and the use of the parsonage.³ His diocese afforded

¹ Hinman's War of the Revolution, p. 548.

² Onderdonk's Revolutionary Incidents in Queen's Co., p. 427.

³ Society Record.

him some additional income. In 1790, he was elected Bishop of Rhode Island, this diocese being united to that of Connecticut.

Bishop Seabury died Feb. 25th, 1796, and was interred with great ceremony and solemnity in the second burial-ground, where his cenotaph is still to be found, the remains from beneath having been since removed. He was succeeded in his pastoral office by his son, the Rev. Charles Seabury, who had previously been preaching in Jamaica, L. I., but was invited to New London immediately after the death of his father. His ministry commenced in March, 1796, and continued eighteen years. In 1814, he was invited to Setauket, L. I., and his connection with the parish of St. James being ecclesiastically dissolved, he removed thither in June of that year.

Since that period the pastors have been:

Rev. Solomon Blakeslee, from 1815 to 1818—three years.

Rev. Bethel Judd, " 1819 to 1832—twelve years.

Rev. Isaac W. Hallam, " 1832 to 1834—two years.

Rev. Robert A. Hallam, previously pastor of the Episcopal church in Meriden, Ct., was called to the rectorship of St. James, in 1834, and assumed the charge Jan. 1st, 1835. He is the eighth rector of the church.

In 1846, the society decided that the interests of the parish required larger accommodations, and passed a vote to build a new church. This has resulted in the erection of a beautiful Gothic edifice, of New Jersey freestone, at the corner of Huntington and Federal Streets. The corner-stone was laid Nov. 3d, 1847, Bishop Henshaw, of Rhode Island, officiating on the occasion. The church was consecrated June 11th, 1850, by Rev. Thomas C. Brownell, Bishop of Connecticut. It is a noble and massive structure, based upon a solid pile of masonry, and if assailed by no enemy but time, will probably endure for ages. The style is cruciform, that is, having a wing or recess upon each side. The tower is in the corner. The interior length is one hundred and eight feet; width of the nave, forty-four; across the transept, eighty; height of the tower and spire, one hundred and fifty-six. Architect, Upjohn, of New York.

This church, in completeness of design and architectural elegance, holds the first rank among the ecclesiastical edifices of the state. It is also a gratifying fact that the society is unincumbered with any debt for its erection; the whole cost, which was upward of \$60,000, being entirely covered by successive subscriptions.¹

¹ The contributions for the first Episcopal church in New London, built in 1730,

A monument is erected in this church to the memory of Bishop Seabury, by contributions from the dioceses of Connecticut and Rhode Island. His remains were removed from the burial-place, and deposited in the tomb underneath this monument.

Methodists. In the year 1789, Jesse Lee, a distinguished preacher of the Methodist denomination, came through Connecticut, and laid the foundation of Methodism, not only for this state, but for all New England. His first sermon in New London, was preached at the court-house, Sept. 2d, 1789; he was here again in June, 1790, and both times was cordially received by members of the Baptist denomination. In 1791, Bishop Asbury visited the city, and preached also in the court-house.¹ Class meetings were commenced at the house of Richard Douglas, who, together with his wife and daughter, were some of the first converts to Methodism in the place. The New London circuit was instituted in 1793, and a society was formed consisting of eleven persons, in October of that year. The next spring, their number was considerably enlarged, and preparatory measures were taken toward the erection of a meeting-house or chapel. An eligible site was chosen, on what was then called Golden Hill, where an area of twenty-six and a half square rods was purchased for £45.

The trustees of the society were Richard Douglas, Daniel Burrows, George Potter, Peter Griffin, Isaiah Bolles, Luther Gale, and John Shepherd. These were the founders of the Methodist church in New London. Most of them were previously members of the Baptist church. Messrs. Burrows and Griffin were subsequently ordained, and became local preachers.

The same year the class was joined by Jacob Stockman, from the Congregational church. These with their wives, and a few other zealous and discreet females, formed the base and central portion of the society.

In July, 1795, the Methodist conference met at New London,² at the house of Daniel Burrows; Bishop Asbury presided, and eighteen other preachers attended. Amos G. Thompson was that year upon

amounted to £550, and this was the whole cost of the building, excepting the pews, which were built by individuals. The difference of expenditure in that church, and the church of 1850, vividly illustrates the progress of society.

¹ New London Gazette.

² Ibid.

the New London circuit; an engaged and engaging preacher, who, some four years later, embraced Congregationalism, and was ordained over the church in Montville.

The female members of the society discarded all ornamental attire, and appeared in the plain cottage bonnet and strict simplicity of dress which marked the Methodist women of that day.¹ New things almost invariably meet with some opposition, and many absurd reports were circulated respecting the Methodists. The class meetings were regarded with doubt and suspicion, and stigmatized as *dark meetings*, or *secret societies*. It was a strange thing to see young women casting aside their feathers, their ribbons, and their high, airy looks, and the young men their shoe-buckles, hat-bands, and jolly manners, and both classes moving about in such demure simplicity. These peculiarities marked them out for censure or ridicule.

Their house of worship was not erected without many struggles and reverses. Their first attempt to raise the necessary funds was made in 1793, but their chapel was not built till 1798. It is stated in the journal of Asbury,² that the frame was raised on Monday, July 16th, and the house dedicated the next Sunday. Asbury and Jesse Lee were both present, and preached on the occasion. The dedication sermon was by Lee, from these words: "This day is salvation come to this house."

The chapel was occupied for two years in an unfinished state, un-plastered and unglazed. It was completed in 1800. In April, 1808, a session of the New England Conference was held in it, Bishop Asbury presiding. This meeting of the conference, and a subsequent visit from Jesse Lee, in July, excited much interest, and a remarkable revival followed. Many persons were affected in the way which has been called *losing their strength*; that is, falling down and remaining for a longer or shorter time, apparently lifeless. This was not a state of distress caused by conviction of sin, but was understood to be a condition of indescribable rapture, in which the physical powers were prostrated by an excess of devout emotion. At one meeting, in New London, Elder Washburn, who presided, states that twenty persons fell to the floor, and lay helpless from one to five hours. He adds the following special case:

¹ During the week before the sitting of the conference, seventeen Methodist bonnets were made by one milliner—all of the same pattern, a diminutive model having been brought by a circuit preacher from Middletown, in a snuff-box.

² Quoted in Stevens' Memorials of Methodism, p. 370.

"One young lady, whose reputation stood high both in the church, and among those who were without, was insensible fifty-two hours; and when she recovered, and sat down at a table to take some refreshment, declared that she felt no difference in the state of her appetite, from what she ordinarily felt when she rose in the morning and sat down to breakfast."¹

At Norwich, similar effects were produced; two young persons fell to the floor and lay there seventy hours, the meeting being kept up the whole time, and persons continually coming and going.²

These scenes were not dissimilar to some that were exhibited at the period of the great awakening, in 1741 and 1742.

The meeting-house or chapel of the society proving unserviceable, and its bounds becoming too narrow, it was sold and removed in 1816. A new one, on the same site, was dedicated, by Bishop George, June 18th, 1818.³ In 1819, the number of members was three hundred and twenty-one.⁴ This, on the whole, must be regarded as the most flourishing period of Methodism in New London. It was made a station, and for several years had a resident minister. Since that time its fortunes have fluctuated: it has had periods of declension and of revival and increase; it has been a station, and then dropped; reappointed and relinquished again.

In 1838, three hundred and seventy-seven members were reported; but divisions existed among them, which, in 1840, led to an open rupture. The church was rent in twain. One party, including the trustees, withdrew from the conference, disclaimed its authority, and called themselves *Independent Methodists*. This party kept possession of the chapel. The other division of regular Methodists, held their services one season in the conference-room of the First Congregational Church; and the next in the court-house. But subsequently, under the leading of Rev. Ralph W. Allen, they erected a church in Washington Street, which was dedicated December 8th, 1842. By a decision of the civil court in 1849, this society has also obtained possession of the old church. They are now proprietors of two chapels or houses of worship, though they have but one congregation. The number of members reported in 1851, is two hundred and nineteen.⁵

¹ Stevens' Memorials of Methodism, p. 415.

² Ibid.

³ Gazette.

⁴ Stevens, p. 872.

⁵ Minutes of Conference.

The ninth annual session of the Providence Conference, was held in New London in April, 1849.

The seceding or independent Methodists, after keeping together for a few years, gradually relinquished their public services ; but in 1850, a few of the remaining members united with other Christians, in establishing a Bethel meeting, under a Methodist preacher. This society having purchased the Union school-house in Huntington Street, and fitted it for a house of worship, constitute the tenth worshiping assembly in New London at the present time, 1852.

Baptists. The church which now bears the designation of the First Baptist Church of New London, was constituted in February, 1804, by a colony of about fifty members from the Waterford Baptist church, most of whom resided within the limits of New London. Jonathan Sizer and Henry Harris were chosen the first deacons.

The position chosen for their house of worship, was a platform of rock, on a summit of the ledge that runs through the central part of the city. It was commenced in 1805, and was occupied nearly ten years in an unfinished state ; the beams and rafters left naked, and with loose, rough planks for seats. The interior was then finished, and the whole edifice has since been enlarged and improved.

Rev. Samuel West, the associate of Elder Darrow, was the first pastor of the church. After a ministry of ten years, he was dismissed at his own request in January, 1814.¹

Rev. Nehemiah Dodge officiated from 1816 to 1821, and remained in the church till 1823, when he was excluded, on the ground that he had embraced Universalist principles. They have since been served by ten other pastors, making twelve in all. Rev. Charles Willett is the present minister.

In 1847, under the ministry of Rev. Jabez S. Swan, the members of this church amounted to six hundred and twenty-five, probably the largest church ever known in New London county. It has since colonized and formed another church. The number of members reported in 1850, is four hundred and five.

¹ He removed to Saybrook, where he died in 1837. He spent one year, (1828,) after his removal, with his former flock at New London. Elder West was born in Hopkinton, R. I., and brought up in the Seventh-Day principles. The small brick house in Union Street, near the Baptist church, was his dwelling-house in New London.

In the year 1840, Rev. C. C. Williams, the officiating pastor of the church, and a considerable number of the members, withdrew and organized the second Baptist church and society in New London. This society erected a house of worship in Union Street, on another part of the same ledge of rock upon which the other is founded,¹ which was dedicated Dec. 16th, 1840, and the church recognized by a council convened for the occasion, the same month. The withdrawal of this colony was in the first instance displeasing to the main body of the old church, and they excluded Elder Williams and six of the chief supporters of the enterprise, from their fellowship; but in 1842, a reconciliation of the two churches was effected by the mediation of Elder John Peck.

The second church has had four pastors; the present one is Rev. Edwin R. Warren. In 1850, the number of members was four hundred and eight.

A third Baptist church was constituted March 14th, 1849, by a division of one hundred and eighty-five members from the first church. This society purchased the brick church in Huntington Street, built six years previous by the Universalist society, for \$12,000, and dedicated it as their house of worship, March 29th, 1849. Sermon by Rev. J. S. Swan, who was the chief mover in the enterprise, founder and pastor of the church. In 1850, the number of members was three hundred and eleven.

Universalists. A Universalist society was formed in New London in the year 1835, and occasional services held, but no church was erected or regular ministry established, till 1843, when an edifice of brick was erected on Huntington Street, and dedicated March 20th, 1844. Rev. T. J. Greenwood was its pastor for four years. In 1849, it was sold by the trustees, in order to liquidate the debts of the society, and was purchased by the Third Baptist Church. In August, of the same year, the Universalist society purchased the former Episcopcal church on Main Street, for \$3,500. As this was thoroughly

¹ During the year 1850, when the city authorities were lowering Union Street, the Second Baptist Society had the rock in front of their church cut down, and an excavation made beneath the building, where a neat and commodious lecture-room has been finished. In accomplishing this, about two thousand loads of solid stone were removed.

repaired and improved in 1835, it is still a valuable and commodious edifice.

Rev. James W. Dennis is their second and present pastor.

Roman Catholics. A small Roman Catholic chapel was built on Jay Street, in 1842, and dedicated May 13th, 1850, by Rev. Dr. Fitzpatrick, of Boston.

NOTE.—It has been mentioned in the foregoing chapter, that the remains of Bishop Seabury had been removed from the burial-ground to the vault of St. James' Church. The tablet which covered his grave still remains. The epitaph, which has been much admired for its classic purity and neatness of expression, is attributed to John Bowden, D. D., Professor in Columbia College. It is as follows:

Here lieth the Body of
SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.,
Bishop of Connecticut and Rhode Island,
Who departed from this transitory scene
Feb. 25th, 1796, in the 68th year of his age.
Ingenious without pride, learned without pedantry,
Good without severity, he was duly qualified
To discharge the duties of the Christian and the Bishop.
In the pulpit he enforced religion,
In his conduct he exemplified it.
The poor he assisted with his charity,
The ignorant he blessed with his instruction.
The friend of man, he ever desired their good,
The enemy of vice, he ever opposed it.
Christian! dost thou aspire to happiness,
Seabury has shown the way that leads to it.

CHAPTER XXXV.

Ecclesiastical notices of Groton.—Villages of Groton.—Ledyard made a town. Pine Swamp.—Pequot reservation.—Remains of the tribe.—Montville made a town.—Succession of ministers.—Churches struck by lightning.—Baptist churches.—Decline of Congregationalism.—The Huckleberry meeting-house.—Miner meeting-house.—Waterford made a town.—Niantic Bay.—The Darrow church.—Jordan church.—Seventh-day church.—East Lyme made a town.—Niantic Bar or Nahant.—The old synagogue.—Black Point.

In this chapter, the ancient town will be resumed, in order to give a brief sketch of the recent history of those offsets which are now independent towns.

GROTON.

Rev. Aaron Kinney was ordained over the south Congregational church in Groton, as successor to Mr. Barber, Oct. 19th, 1769. He was a native of Lisbon, Ct., and graduated at Yale College, in 1765. The circumstances of his family were such as to render an ample income necessary, while his actual receipts were scanty. The total inadequacy of his salary to his support, led to his dismission, Nov. 5th, 1798, at which time his family consisted of an invalid wife and eleven children under seventeen years of age. His subsequent life was filled with wanderings, trials and removals; he died in Ohio, in 1824, aged seventy-nine.¹

After the departure of Mr. Kinney, both the north and south Congregational societies were left without a minister, and the sacred edifices in both places falling into decay, that forlorn aspect was presented which called forth the animadversions of Dr. Dwight, who in his travels written at that period, censures the inhabitants of Groton

¹ Allen's Biographical Dictionary.

for their indifference to religion, and their negligence in the support of public worship.

North Groton remained without a ministry and the ordinances of religion, from 1772 to 1810. When at length the spirit of other and better days revived, the old church could not be found—not a member remained. A reorganization was effected Dec. 12th, 1810, with five new members, one male and four females. Perhaps no smaller number was ever regularly embodied into a church.¹ This society, uniting with the first or south society, called the Rev. Timothy Tuttle to the joint charge of both parishes. He was ordained in the south church, August 14th, 1811.

Mr. Tuttle continued pastor of the associated churches for twenty-three years; occupying alternately houses of worship five miles apart. In 1834, his relation to the south society was dissolved, and he became the exclusive pastor of the northern parish, now Ledyard. The old meeting-house in this parish, after keeping its station through the storms of one hundred and sixteen years—a period which in our young country seems like a great antiquity—has given place to a neat and commodious edifice, which was dedicated Dec. 6th, 1843. “Beautiful for situation,” on the central height of the town, this little church stands with its spire “a pencil in the sky,” pointing toward heaven, and its bell wafting solemn sounds among the everlasting hills.

The south church, after the harmonious separation from the north, remained destitute of a settled minister five years. Rev. Jared R. Avery, a native of Groton and graduate of Williams College, was installed October 9th, 1839; dismissed at his own request in April, 1851. Rev. George H. Woodward was installed the same year.

The ancient Baptist church of Groton, have relinquished their former sacred habitation on Wightman Hill, and removed to a new house of worship at the Head of Mystic. Four other Baptist churches have been established within the bounds of Groton; two of them at Noank and Groton Bank, in 1843. The house of worship on Groton Bank was dedicated June 4th, 1845. The present pastor is Rev. N. T. Allen.

¹ “We had not, like our Puritan fathers, seven pillars to begin with. We had but one main pillar, and even that one, before another could be joined with it, was removed by the hand of death.” (Sermon of Rev. T. Tuttle at the dedication of the new meeting-house, 1848.)

A Methodist society was established at the village of Galetown, soon after the commencement of the present century, which owed much to the fostering care of Rev. Ralph Hurlbut, a native of the place, and a local preacher of the Methodist connection. The number of members in 1851, was seventy-six. There is also a church of this denomination at Mystic Bridge, of about one hundred members.

Groton Bank, opposite New London, is noted for its beautiful and conspicuous situation. Owing to the regular and rapid slope of the ground, the whole village, and almost every building in it, can be seen at one view.

Mystic River, the eastern boundary of Groton, is remarkable for its villages, and the villages for the enterprise of their inhabitants. At Lower Mystic and Noank, houses are perched upon cliffs, and in the hollows and crevices of naked rock ; streets seem to run perpendicularly, and the churches sit like eagles upon the tops of the rocks. The choicest gardens and the richest farms of this energetic people are at sea. They are the founders of Key West, and the skillful navigators of Floridian reefs. Their enterprising seamen double Cape Horn in fishing-smacks, and are at home on all oceans and in all latitudes.

John Ledyard, the noted traveler ; Col. William Ledyard, of Fort Griswold ; Rev. Samuel Seabury, Bishop of Connecticut and Rhode Island, and Silas Dean, envoy to France during the Revolutionary War, were natives of Groton.

LEDYARD.

In 1836, the northern part of Groton, comprising a tract about six miles square, was incorporated as a separate town, by the name of Ledyard. In this township there is but one village, that of Galetown, or Gale's Ferry, situated on the Thames, seven miles north of New London, and containing about twenty houses. It received its name from a former proprietor, who established a ferry at the place, and during the Revolutionary War had a ship-yard on the point, where vessels were built to cruise against the British.

Ledyard is in general a hilly, wood-land township, with many ledges of rock and steep declivities, that no attempt has been made to cultivate. But the farmers are a race of true-hearted men ; their houses and barns large and comfortable : their corn-fields, their pastures, and their herds spreading orderly over the hills, speak of intelligence, prosperity and independence.

The ancient mast or pine swamp, belonging equally to the towns of New London and Groton, was in Ledyard. It was divided in 1787, by a line running due north "from Kennedy's great spring to Williams' Island," and both parts soon afterward sold to individuals. A large portion of it has since been reclaimed and cultivated, and there is nothing left to recall the dark and dismal ideas that were connected with the Ohomowauk or Owl's Nest of the Indians. The vicinity is known as a favored locality of the rose-bay laurel, *rhododendron maximum*, and people resort thither in the early part of July, to admire this beautiful shrub and gather its flowers. In former years many of these laurel clumps could be found, with the central plants twenty feet in height, and when these were crowned with large clusters of rose-colored blossoms, the dense and miry swamp was transformed into a magnificent flower-garden.

Mashantucket, the last retreat of the Pequot Indians, is in Ledyard. The reservation consists of about 900 acres, and is for the most part, a region of craggy, well-forested hills, with valleys so deep as to give rise to the popular exaggeration that in winter the day is but an hour long, from sunrise to sunset. That portion of the reservation which has been cleared, is leased to white tenants. Only sixteen of the tribe, in 1850, were regarded as regular Pequots, that is, inheriting by the mother, which is the Indian law of succession, and on that side of full blood. These sixteen belong to five families; eight more, (the *George* family,) are of mixed origin; two families of the Stonington tribe are residents on the land, making in all seven families, and about thirty persons.¹

In 1766, the whole number of the tribe was 164, of whom only thirty were men. Of the forty-six females over sixteen years of age, thirteen were widows. Several of these had undoubtedly been bereaved by the French War, in which a number of the tribe had served as soldiers.

The most striking fact connected with this remnant of the red race is, that they do not advance. They are just what they were two centuries ago. The Pequot of the present day is just the Pequot that Winthrop found at Nameaug; he has perhaps taken a step downward, but none upward, except in the case of a few individuals who have become thorough Christians. The last full-blooded Pequot of

¹ Most of this information respecting the present state of the tribe was gathered on the spot, and principally from Col. William Morgan, the present overseer of the Indians.

this tribe, pure both by father and mother, was Frederick Toby, who died in 1848.

In North Stonington only three families are left, comprising from fifteen to twenty persons, on a reservation of 240 acres, which is leased out to white tenants. Several families from these two reservations have at different times removed to the west, and settled among other Indian tribes. In 1850, certain Indians dwelling in Wisconsin, and bearing the surnames of *Charles*, *George*, *Poquonup* and *Ske-sooch*, applied to the Connecticut legislature for a share of the rental of the Groton lands; but they were not able to prove the purity of their descent.

MONTVILLE.

In 1786, those portions of New London that had been known as the North Parish and Chesterfield district, were incorporated into a separate town, called Montville, a name descriptive of its elevated and retired situation. The first town meeting in this new organization was held in November, 1786.

Joshua Raymond, Moderator.

John Raymond, Jr., Town-Clerk.

Selectmen.

Nathaniel Comstock, Stephen Billings,

Asa Worthington, Joseph Davis,

Peter Comstock.

Rev. David Jewett, second minister of the North Parish, died in 1783, aged sixty-six, after a ministry of forty-five years' duration. The admissions to the church during that time were 136 whites, and twenty-one Mohegan Indians. A considerable breach occurred in his church between 1742 and 1750; from eighteen to twenty members withdrew, and ultimately united with the Baptist denomination. Isaac Hammond and wife were the first to secede, and were called Congregational Separates; but their son Noah afterward became a Baptist preacher.

Rev. Rozel Cook, previously minister in Watertown, Litchfield county, succeeded Mr. Jewett, and was ordained June 30th, 1784. In 1789, a fund was raised by subscription for the support of the minister, and the system of taxation, which had become odious and burdensome, was abandoned. The sum raised and funded was £1,067; the subscription list comprises ninety-one names, which was probably

the full number of families belonging to the congregation. Mr. Cook died April 18th, 1798, in the forty-second year of his age.

Rev. Amos G. Thompson was installed September 26th, 1799. He had previously belonged to the Methodist Episcopal denomination, and had been ordained elder by Bishop Asbury, at Leesburg, Virginia, in 1790. Withdrawing from that connection in 1798, he offered himself as a candidate for the Congregational ministry, and was examined and approved by the association of Windham county, Connecticut, which accepted his ordination as valid. His ministry in Montville was short; he died October 23d, 1801, in the thirty-eighth year of his age.

Rev. Abishai Alden, installed August 17th, 1803; dismissed in 1826.

Rev. Rodolphus Landfear, installed August 21st, 1827; dismissed in 1832.

Since this period the society has settled no minister, but has been served by pastors engaged by the year, or for a series of years.

The first meeting-house built for Mr. Hillhouse, was taken down in 1770, and a second, which we may call the Jewett meeting-house, erected in a more central position, on land given by Joshua Raymond, and vested in the society by deed of April 23d, 1772. This building stood just seventy-five years. It was much shattered by a thunderbolt that descended and struck the house, during the afternoon service, Sunday, May 25th, 1828. By this awful stroke two persons were killed, Mrs. Betsey Bradford, and a child of Capt. John R. Comstock, aged nine years; the former perhaps by a blow from the shivered timbers, but the latter by the lightning. Several others were wounded and stunned. The bolt struck the steeple, and entered the house at the pew where the persons killed were sitting, shivered the post to splinters, and entirely demolished the pew. The side of the house was riven, and windows broken in all parts of the building.

Several churches in this vicinity have at various times suffered by lightning. The Congregational church in Lyme town was consumed by fire, kindled by a thunderbolt, July 3d, 1815. The calamity which befell the old meeting-house in New London, that stood on the town square, has been noticed. Its successor, on Zion's Hill, has been twice struck within the memory of the present generation. May 2d, 1804, the bolt descended upon the spire, partly melted the vane, tore off the points of the conductor, and passed off by the electric rod, tearing up the ground with a tremendous force, in two directions. July 13th, 1825, the fluid descended along the rod to the

lower floor, then entered and passed off at the doors and one window, which were much shattered. It struck at the same time the corner post of a house in the neighborhood, passing over an intermediate building, (Masonic Hall.) May 27th, 1850, the Universalist (formerly Episcopal) church, in Main Street, was struck by lightning, and considerably injured. The lightning passed off by the stove-pipe, or the house would probably have been burnt. These are but a few illustrations of the danger to which high buildings are exposed from the electric element. We may add that the flag-staffs of Forts Griswold and Trumbull, have both been shivered by lightning; the latter on the 31st of July, 1821; and that the court-house has also suffered in the same way.¹

The Montville church was taken down in 1847, and a new one built on the same site. Under the old church, lying flat upon its face, was found the gravestone of a young maiden of the name of Bliss, who died in 1747, just one century before. No record or tradition could give any account of it. It was replaced in the same position, and left under the new church.

A small society of Separates was gathered in the North Parish, in 1750, and Joshua Morse ordained their elder, May 17th. They kept together about thirty years; but Elder Morse removing in 1799, to Sandisfield, Mass., the society became extinct. They were Baptists, but it is understood that they held to open communion. From the seed sown by Elder Morse, the Palmer Baptist church of Montville is supposed to have sprung. This latter church began with twelve persons, in 1787. Elder Reuben Palmer was the founder, leader, and in fact, the sole pastor of this society, as after his death in 1822, they never chose a successor. It gradually declined, and was soon considered extinct, though not formally dissolved by its own vote till 1842.

The fragment that remained of the Palmer church was merged in a new one gathered in 1842, under the name of the Union Baptist Church of Montville. A house of worship about a mile distant from the Palmer church, was dedicated October 4th, 1842. Elder Levi Meach was instrumental in the formation of this church and was its

¹ Several of these disasters were undoubtedly owing to imperfections in the lightning rods, or want of skill in setting them. Where the buildings stood on a substratum of rock, care was not always taken to lead the conductor to a sufficient stock of earth and moisture. In the case of the court-house, it is said that the lower end of the rod was actually fixed in a hole bored in solid rock.

first pastor. Nicholas T. Allen, now of Groton Bank, was ordained in this church August 12th, 1846.

The Methodists have two societies within the bounds of Montville, one at Uncasville, with sixty-five members, and one near Salem, with seventy-nine members.¹

In a large part of the ancient North Parish of New London, Baptist and Methodist societies have taken the place of Congregationalism, which in the early age of the town was the sole denomination. This is also the case in that part of the old town which is now Waterford. An aged inhabitant of the latter place, whose memory reached back to 1750, and whose residence was upward of four miles from the New London church, said that in his younger days he had frequently walked into town to meeting, with forty persons who came from beyond him. These were the early settlers of Chesterfield district, and consisted in great part of Latimers, a tall and robust race, to whom a walk of eight miles was but an agreeable recreation. As they passed along, the number was continually increasing by streams that flowed in from either side, till as they came down by the old pound corner to the meeting-house green, they seemed a congregation of themselves.

In those days the *ride-and-tie* system prevailed to some extent. It was no uncommon thing for a farmer who had a good family horse, to take his wife behind him and ride about half the distance to meeting; then dismount and walk the remainder of the way, leaving the horse fastened to some bar-post, for the use of a neighbor and his wife, who were privileged to share the accommodation, and were on the road behind.

To attend Sabbath worship at such a distance was a heavy burden, and in some cases too grievous to be borne. Most of the Chesterfield people afterward went to Mr. Jewett's church, but this also was a weary distance; and in 1758, the following persons were released from the obligation of attending meeting and paying rates in the North Parish, "in consideration that they heard preaching elsewhere:" Capt. Jonathan Latimer, Samuel Bishop, Sen. and Jun., Richard Chapel, Walter Chappell, and James Johnston.

Soon after this the Chesterfield people made an attempt to found a Congregational church in their own neighborhood. It can not now be determined when the society was constituted; it took the designation of "The Ecclesiastical Presbyterian establishment of Chester-

field Society." Land for the site of a meeting-house, and for a burial-ground adjoining, was given to the society by Jonathan Latimer, in 1773, at which time it is probable that the meeting-house was built and opened for service. Jesse Beckwith was one of the chief promoters of the undertaking.

Who were the pastors of this church, how long it held together, when embodied or when dissolved, or, in point of fact, whether any church was ever regularly constituted by the society, are points involved in obscurity.

The meeting-house stood on Latimer Hill, overlooking the fair Chesterfield valley, but in the midst of fields so rugged and primitive in their aspect, and so hedged around with tree, bush and briar, that it acquired the name by which it is now only remembered, the old Huckleberry meeting-house. In the latter years of its existence, the services held in it were principally by Baptists. It was occupied on the whole, for occasional meetings, sometimes by preachers and sometimes by lay-brethren, for nearly fifty years. The house of worship has entirely disappeared, but the graveyard where the members of the congregation, the Beckwiths, Bishops, Chapells, Deshons, Holmes's, Latimers, Moores, Tinkers, repose in their silent chambers, points out its situation.

About the year 1825, another attempt was made to found a Congregational church in Chesterfield district. A new house of worship was built, and a church constituted, of which the Rev. Nathaniel Miner was ordained pastor, in 1826. Its members were few and widely scattered; at the end of five years it was completely overshadowed and consumed by a Baptist church that rose and flourished by its side. Mr. Miner removed to Millington society, East Haddam, in 1831, and the church became extinct. The sacred edifice still remains, unglazed, black and ruinous, a melancholy witness, and the only one remaining, to testify that a church was once gathered on the spot.

WATERFORD.

In the year 1801, New London was restricted to such narrow dimensions, as to render her, in point of domain, the smallest town in the state. All north and west of the city limits, comprising more than two-thirds of the whole area, was, by act of the Legislature at the May session, constituted a distinct town by the name of Waterford. The petition upon which the act was grounded, was presented

by Isaac Rogers, in behalf of the inhabitants of the withdrawing portion of the town, and the only reason assigned was the inconvenience to which many were subjected, by their distance from the town-plot, where the public meetings were held. The separation was amicable and mutually satisfactory.

The name, *Waterford*, is said to have been suggested by Isaac Rogers, who was the agent of the town in procuring the separation. It has an evident reference to its situation on the Sound and Niantic Cove, with a fordable stream, the Jordan, running through it from north to south.

The first town-meeting was summoned, according to the act of incorporation, by Griswold Avery, and held at the Darrow meeting-house, second Tuesday in November, 1801. Mr. Avery was the moderator of that, and all subsequent town-meetings, until 1807, when he was succeeded by George Williams.

First Selectmen.—Griswold Avery, George Williams, Isaac Rogers, Thomas Douglas.

First Town-Clerk.—Stephen Maynard.

Niantic Bay, sometimes called Black Bay, lies west of Waterford, and is noted for a thriving trade. In the river above the bar, many vessels were formerly built, but the greater cheapness of timber on the coast of Maine, has transferred this kind of business to that quarter. The granite quarry at Millstone Point, belonging to the family of the late Benajah Gardiner, was not wrought to any extent before the year 1834; but it now turns out annually about 30,000 tuns of stone,¹ which is shipped principally to New York, Philadelphia and Charleston, S. C. Independent of the quarry, many small vessels are owned in this vicinity,² and have their home in the bay.

From the first settlement of the country, this expanse of water has been noted for fish. In some seasons the bass have abounded to an almost incredible degree;³ the blackfish caught here, usually compete with the first and best in the market, and the coast is supplied with an almost inexhaustible store of clams and lobsters. It was this productiveness of the waters which made the bay a favorite resort of the aborigines. In summer, the simple sons of the forest would come

¹ Statistics laid before the harbor and river convention of Chicago, in 1847.

² The number stated in 1847, was thirty-two.

³ "Four men in one night, (Jan. 5th, 1811,) caught near the bridge at the head of Niantic River, with a small seine, 9,900 pounds of bass. They were sent to New York in a smack, and sold for upwards of \$300." *New London Gazette*.

down from their scattered homes in the interior, to recruit and feast on the sea-shore. The Mohegans appear to have had a prescriptive or seigniorial right, not only to fish, but to build on the shores. They had a fort at the head of Niantic River, to which they retired when their fields were overrun by the Narragansetts; and thither in the year 1658, their enemies pursued and besieged them. This was a critical period in the life of Uncas; he might have fallen into the hands of his enemies, had not a few gallant men from New London hastened to his assistance, under the command of Lieut. James Avery.

The early white settlers of the interior, following the example of the red men, were accustomed in the clam and blackfish season, to pour down in companies, on horseback, single, double and even treble, with or without saddle and pillion, to bathe in the sea, and feast upon its dainties. Nor has this custom entirely passed away. Pine Neck and other portions of the bay are still in the summer season, favorite places of resort.

About the year 1748, a Baptist church was organized at the West Farms, or Nahantic district of New London, now Waterford. Nathan Howard was ordained elder, and John Beckwith, deacon. At the house of the latter, all the first meetings were held. The original number of members is said to have been sixteen. This church originated from a society of Congregational separates. Elder Howard was one of the converts of the great revival of 1741, and had united with the church of the Rev. Eliphalet Adams at that period, but afterward joined a party that seceded, and were kept together a couple of years under the teaching of Mr. Timothy Allen. Most of the separates ultimately embraced Baptist principles. Not long after the Howard church was gathered, another small community of Baptists, originating likewise from Congregational separates, was organized in or near the town-plot of New London. Noah Hammond, also a convert of the great revival, and a former attendant on Mr. Jewett's ministry, was ordained elder, and Zadoc Darrow, deacon. This society erected the frame of a meeting-house, about a mile from the town plot, but were unable to proceed any further with the building. Elder Hammond was invited to Long Island, and his church soon afterward coalesced with that of Nahantic, under Elder Howard. Zadoc Darrow was chosen deacon of the united church.

The office of a religious teacher, is seldom pursued for a longer term of years by any person, than it was by Zadoc Darrow. He dated his conversion from the New Light preaching of Joshua Morse.

which took a strong hold of him when he was quite a young man ; and from that time to an old age verging on a century of years, he was regarded by the Baptists as a zealous and faithful advocate, and a special blessing to their church.

He was ordained in 1769, by Elder Stephen Babcock,¹ but without any particular charge, Elder Howard continuing the pastor of the church. Three Baptist elders, all earnest men, and diligent in their calling, were then living at the West Farms, Howard, Darrow and Eliphalet Lester, and all natives of New London, where they were born respectively in the years 1721, 1728, and 1729.

Elder Lester afterward accepted a call to Saybrook, and Elder Howard was suddenly removed, March 2d, 1777, by the small-pox. He had previously given the society a plot of land for a burial-place,² and was himself the first person laid to rest within the peaceful inclosure. Elder Darrow now became the sole pastor of the church, and made great exertions to have a house of worship erected. He gave himself the ground for a site, opposite the Howard burial-place, and as soon as the land had rest from war, the frame of the old Hammond meeting-house was removed thither, reerected, and put into comfortable order for preaching by the year 1788. The elder and his people, laboring together, performed with their own hands most of the work.

A notice of this church, written about 1790, says :

" They hold to close communion, and do not enjoin the laying on of hands at baptism : every member, whether male or female, is allowed to exhort in meeting, and at admission into the church, makes a public declaration of experiences."

The most flourishing period of Elder Darrow's ministry, was between 1790 and 1800. He had a great revival in 1794, the baptisms that year amounting to ninety-one. The number of members arose to nearly two hundred and fifty. But a period of declension and difficulty followed, and the number was greatly diminished. Long before the death of Elder Darrow, he was affected with palsy, and after that event, though he continued to preach, he always had an asso-

¹ This fact has not been found in print, but is stated on manuscript authority supposed to be reliable.

² The gift was confirmed and the ground enlarged by an additional purchase from Daniel Howard, in 1786, at which time the title was vested in "John Beckwith, Lemuel Darrow, Constant Crocker, and the rest of the members of the Baptist church and society in New London, west part, or Nihantick." New London Deeds.

ciate with him in the pastoral office. He died Feb. 16th, 1827, aged ninety-eight years and two months.

Samuel West was associated with Elder Darrow from 1802 to 1809. Francis Darrow, the grandson of the aged elder, was then ordained, and associated with his venerable ancestor till the death of the latter, when he became the sole pastor.

A new house of worship was built by this society in 1848, in the Jordan district, two or three miles distant from the former. The first century of the church was just then completed; the Jordan church took the place of the Darrow church, and upon the verge of this transition, the third reverend elder passed away. Elder Francis Darrow died Oct. 15th, 1850, aged seventy-one.

The life of one of the members of this church, Stedman Newbury, runs like a parallel line by the side of it. He was born in 1752 and died in December, 1850, wanting but four months of ninety-nine years of age, and had been for seventy years a member of the church.

About the year 1812, an attempt was made to found another Baptist church in Waterford, at a place called Great Hill, five or six miles from New London. A church was constituted, and Rev. Jonathan Ames ordained their minister, June 12th, 1816. They had no house of worship, but kept together, holding their meetings in a school-house, till the death of Elder Ames, in 1830. The church that had originated in his labors, died with him. The members dispersed and united with other churches.

A Baptist church was constituted in 1835, at Quaker Hill, in the vicinity of the river Thames, which takes the designation of Second Baptist Church in Waterford. Elder Erastus Doty was its founder. In 1850, it reports one hundred and sixteen members.

A third church of this denomination was constituted in 1842, at Sandy Hill, near Lake's Pond, by a colony of forty members from the Darrow church, and Gurdon T. Chappell ordained their pastor, Dec. 8th, 1842. A house of worship was erected in 1844. The number of members reported is one hundred and fifty.

North-west of Lake's Pond, in Chesterfield society, Montville, is yet another Baptist church, originating in part from the Darrow church. It was organized in 1824, with thirty-five members; in 1850, reported one hundred and fifty-two. The Darrow church has been a fruitful seed-bed of Baptist principles. She is emphatically the mother church of the New London association.

The society of Sabbatarians, or Seventh-day Baptists, of the Great Neck, Waterford, date their commencement from the year 1674.

They remained for the space of a century, members of the Westerly and Hopkinton church, with which they first united, but were constituted a distinct church, Nov. 2d, 1784. The number of members was fourteen—seven males and seven females—all of the former except one, and of the latter except two, bearing the name of Rogers. Davis Rogers was ordained elder, and William Wescote, deacon. Elder Rogers removed, in 1809, with others of the society, to Preston, Chenango county, N. Y.

Jabez Beebe, of Lyme, was ordained as an assistant to Elder Rogers, in 1796; but about the year 1815, he also removed to Preston. Lester Rogers was ordained elder, Sept. 24th, 1812; died, April 1st, 1822. His son, Lester T. Rogers, was ordained Jan. 1st, 1824.

In 1816, this society erected a house of worship, and held their first service in it Jan. 9th, 1817. In this house, Benedict Wescote was ordained elder, Feb. 9th, 1832. He removed soon afterward with a second company from this society, to Preston, N. Y.; but returning to his ancient home on a visit in 1841, he died Nov. 26th, aged forty-four.

Elder Lester T. Rogers died in 1850.

EAST LYME.

In May, 1839, Waterford was diminished in point of territory by the incorporation of East Lyme. This new town consisted of the eastern part of Lyme, and that part of Waterford which lay west of Niantic River. The town at first opposed the separation, on the sole ground, as appeared by their vote, "that Waterford was none too large." But the new town offering to assume the responsibility of the Niantic Ferry and Bridge, the older portion accepted the compromise, and withdrew their opposition. The Niantic Bridge Company had long been an annoyance to them, and the town had repeatedly petitioned the Assembly, that the charter of the company might be withdrawn, and their privileges abrogated. They regarded the bridge as unsafe, the draw vexatious, and the whole concern a nuisance, destroying their navigation and impeding the fisheries.

The bar at the ferry is one of nature's curiosities. It projects from the western side, forming a natural bridge of sand almost across the bay, leaving but just space along the eastern bank for the compressed waters to struggle through. It is here that art is called upon to produce her substitutions and complete the land passage.

The bridge company was incorporated in 1796; the old way of crossing by ropes and boats—a clumsy and hazardous mode of conveyance—had continued till then. Messrs. Wm. Stewart, Elias Perkins and Jared Starr, the committee of the company, purchased the ferry privilege of the Dursey family, and erected a toll-bridge,¹ with a draw to accommodate vessels. The New Haven railway now runs by the side of the bridge over the bar; it has also a draw at the water gap.

The prospect from the bar is of a pleasing character; on one side is the open Sound, closed in the distance by Plum Island, which is here *the island*, by way of eminence, and by Black Point, running far out with a bold, free sweep. Wigwam Rock is on the south western shore; conical in form like an Indian hut, and long known as a township boundary mark. On the north side of the bar, the water seems a lovely inland lake, encircled by cultivated farms and villages. At the head of it, is the Straits' Bridge. The banks in their native state were covered with ferns and the wild rose.

Sometimes for a number of years the bar is annually diminished by encroaching floods;² then again, it is gradually increased by successive deposits of sand and sea-weed. The cedar-stakes which have been driven into its banks, form a kind of balustrade, which serves as a barrier against the waves. The flood-tides bring a sea-breeze, but at the ebb it is calm, and in summer oppressively hot. In autumn it is a fine position for a sportsman. If he take his stand about sunset, numerous wild ducks and other valued game, steering by the course of the river, may easily be brought down, as their shadows fall upon the sand.

So large a portion of East Lyme having been included within the first bounds laid out for New London, it must not be dismissed to entire independency without a descriptive sketch at parting.

An ecclesiastical society was organized in 1724, or 1725, and known as the East Society of Lyme. In 1726, this society sent a petition to the town of New London, praying for assistance to sup-

1 Dr. Dwight states in his *Travels*, vol. 2, p. 251, that the bridge at Rope Ferry was the first authorized toll-bridge in Connecticut. This is a mistake. Whiting's bridge over the Shetucket, built in 1737, was authorized by the General Court to collect a toll; as were also other bridges over that river. In 1778, when a lottery was granted for erecting a bridge in Norwich, it is stated that they "had been hampered with a toll-bridge, or a dangerous ferry, for near a century past."

2 In the great gale of September, 1815, the water rose ten or twelve feet over this bar.

port the gospel among them, whereupon it was ordered that the estate and persons of all inhabitants living west of Nahantick River, and south of the country road, should be exempted from paying the minister's rates in New London, and pay them to said society.

Rev. George Griswold was the first pastor of this church and society. The meeting-house erected by them stood at least a century. In its advanced age it was colloquially termed the *Old Synagogue*. It was a small, square building, without steeple, bell or porch. A pulpit occupied the center of one side; doors opening directly upon earth, air and sky, were on the other three sides. The gallery was low, projecting gloomily over the pews. The beams, pillars and pilasters were so roughly finished as to show every where the marks of the hatchet. No varnish or paint in any part overshadowed the native wood, which became in age venerably silver-gray. Here, as late as 1820, you might see the old woman's plain linen cap and straight border; the small, black, mode bonnet, kept on by long bonnet pins; the short, red cloak, with the hood falling back; and men with enormous steel shoe-buckles, and checkered pocket handkerchiefs. Old Hundred, Bray and Mear, sung in the pitch, tone and time of the ancients, harmonized admirably with this interesting relic of the past.

This building has been replaced by a stone church, a structure of simple elegance, neatly fitted up and furnished with a marble floor. The society is principally indebted for this church to the liberality of the Griswolds of New York, emigrants from its bosom, who in their adopted homes, show this grateful remembrance of the place of their nativity.

In the burial-place near lie the remains of the first pastor of the church, Rev. George Griswold, who died in 1761, after a faithful ministry of thirty-six years. During the great awakening of 1740 and 1741, he had a large accession to his church, and it is an interesting fact that among the new members were thirteen Niantic Indians.

In the same ground is interred another devoted minister of Lyme, Elder Jason Lee, a pioneer of the Baptist cause, who died in 1810, in the fortieth year of his ministry. His father also lies near, viz., Rev. Joseph Lee, who had been pastor of the Congregational church in Southold, Long Island. He died in 1779; his relict in 1805, in the ninety-ninth year of her age.

The church now known as the First Baptist Church of East Lyme, had its origin like many other Baptist societies, in a small company

of Congregational separates, over whom Ebenezer Mack was ordained pastor, January 12th, 1749.¹ They erected a meeting-house in 1755. The elder and a majority of the church became Baptists, and were received into fellowship with other churches of that denomination, though they continued in the doctrine and practice of open communion until 1795. Elder Jason Lee was ordained in 1771. At his death in 1810, the number of members was 431.

The Second Baptist Church of East Lyme was constituted December 20th, 1842, by united colonies from the Waterford and East Lyme churches.²

Black Point, for which New London and Lyme once contended so vehemently, lies on the west side of the bay. The Niantic Indians have here a reservation of 240 acres, to which an ancient gateway and a green lane leads from the side of the public road. Here we still find ancient names of the tribe, Nonesuch, Sobuck and Wawqueet, although the whole community now comprises scarcely a dozen individuals. On the ridge of land near the Powers farm-house, about half-way between the bay and Four Mile River, the tribe had once a fort. By that term must be understood only a high stone-wall, or a log fence, with wigwams inclosed: no trace of it now remains. The burial-ground of the tribe is on an elevated bank, near the river. Here are stones to the memory of a native minister, Philip Occuish, (who died in 1789,) and his family.

Within a few years, hotels have been erected on Niantic Bay, in situations very alluring to visitors from the interior, seeking health and pleasure on the sea-board. The farm-house, the fisherman's cottage, and the Indian hut, filled to overflowing in the hot season, had probably suggested the undertaking. But a still more important enterprise has recently originated in this vicinity.

Nearly opposite Rope Ferry, about 600 yards from the shore of the bay, is a small lake of pure water. This has been made a source of profit in the way of ice. Messrs. A. & R. Smith, of East Lyme, were the projectors of the undertaking, which commenced in 1845. It is cut out in smooth blocks, two feet wide, and three in length; raised by elevators to a platform on the margin of the lake; and from thence conveyed in cars upon a railway to the shore, where it is discharged on shipboard, or packed into ice-houses, waiting for shipment. At Williamsburgh, near New York, there is a large depot to

1 Hempstead's Journal, MS.

2 Backus' Church History.

receive it. A large number of fishing smacks resort thither for ice. Almost every fisherman now carries out ice in which to pack his fish, which enables him to bring home his cargo in a better condition than he could without it. This is a marked advantage of modern fishing over that of former days.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Incorporation of the city.—Mayors.—Court-house built.—Free grammar-school. Union school.—Female academy.—Parade or public square.—Second burial ground.—Alms-house.—Streets.—Execution of Harry Niles.—Second war with Great Britain.

NEW LONDON was incorporated as a city by the legislature, in January, 1784, being one of five towns in the state on which city privileges were conferred at the same time. The city and town limits are the same, comprising about 2,200 acres, or three and a half square miles. By the charter, all the officers were to be chosen annually, except the mayor and treasurer, who when elected were to remain in office during the pleasure of the General Assembly. The first city meeting was held March 8th, 1784, Winthrop Saltonstall, Esq., moderator. Richard Law was chosen mayor, and continued in office till his death, in January, 1806, twenty-two years, less six weeks. Guy Richards was chosen treasurer, and continued in office till his resignation in 1820, thirty-six years. John Owen was the first city clerk, and continued in office by annual choice till his death in March, 1801; seventeen years. The first aldermen were John Deshon, David Mumford, Winthrop Saltonstall, and Thomas Shaw. Saltonstall served twenty-two years. Col. William Richards was chosen first city sheriff, and annually chosen to the same office till his death in 1812, making twenty-eight years. These instances show that offices in general were more permanent than at the present day. In the common council for nine years, from 1810 to 1819, no change was made. Thaddeus Brooks, Chester Kimball and John Way, served together for sixteen successive years. Way was in the common council from 1803 to 1830 inclusive. Dr. Simon Wolcott and George Colfax, each served twenty-five years, between 1784 and 1812, either in the common council or as aldermen.

The city seal is a full-rigged ship, with sails spread, and the motto, *Mare Liberum*.

The second mayor, Jeremiah G. Brainerd, was chosen in 1806, and resigned in 1829. After this period, the Assembly, upon petition of the city, limited the term of office to three years.

Succession of Mayors.

Richard Law, chosen 1784, to 1806, twenty-two years.
Jeremiah G. Brainerd, 1806, to 1829, twenty-three years.
Elias Perkins, 1829, to 1832, three years.
Coddington Billings, 1832, to 1835, three years.
Noyes Billings, 1835, to 1837, two years, resigned.
Jirah Isham, 1837, one year, resigned.
Francis Allyn, 1838, to 1841, three years.
George C. Wilson, 1841, died July 20th, 1841.
Caleb J. Allen, August 12th, 1841, resigned June, 1843.
Andrew M. Frink, 1843, to 1845, resigned.
J. P. C. Mather, 1845, to 1850, resigned in August.
Andrew C. Lippitt, 1850.

The erection of a court-house was one of the first objects that engaged the attention of the city authorities. The old one burnt by the British, had stood on the Parade, but objections were made to this site, and the position of the new house was finally settled by the following vote :

“April 6th, 1784, voted that it is the opinion of this meeting that the place where the town school-house now stands, at the west end of the Broad Street, [now State Street,] is the fittest place of any in the city, both for use and ornament, and will best accommodate the city and the public, for the court-house to be erected on.”

The county court concurred in this opinion, and the present edifice known as the city court-house, was immediately after erected, the position being fixed in the middle of the street, on the platform of rock, at the head of State Street, with an open space on all sides. It has since been removed further back, so as to leave the highway clear. The house was originally furnished with a gallery around the second story, which gave it a gay and dashing appearance, but the lower story was left for more than thirty years in a rough, unfinished state.

The town school located on this spot was the free grammar-school, which had for its main support the Bartlet and other public revenues, and had been originally established further up the hill, on Hempstead Street, but had descended from thence about 1750. It was now removed a few rods to the north, and placed in the highway fronting

the Erving lot, (Church Street in that part not having been opened,) with no wall or inclosure around it, these not being deemed at that time necessary. The dwelling-houses in this part of the town were few, and the neighboring hills and fields were the play-ground of the boys. In the rear was the Hallam lot, extending from Broad Street to the old meeting-house square, with but one building upon it, and that in its north-east corner. A little more distant, in the rear of the court-house, was the Coit "hollow-lot," shaded by large trees, and enriched with a rivulet of pure water, (where Cottage Street now runs.) Still further back was a vacant upland lot, (known as Fosdick's, or Melally's lot,) containing here and there a choice apple-tree, well known to school-boys: this is now the second burial ground.

We have heard aged people revert to these scenes, the days when they were pupils of the free grammar-school, under the sway of "Master Owen;" when a house of worship had not given name and beauty to Zion's Hill, and only a cellar and a garden, tokens of the former residence of one of the early settlers of the town, were to be seen on the spot where the Trott mansion now stands.¹ Later than this, (about 1796,) General Huntington broke ground upon the hill-side and erected his house, (now Hurlbut's,) in the style called *cottage ornée*. Beyond this, on the present Coit property, was a gushing spring, where the eager school-boy slaked his thirst, and cooled his heated brow; and not a quarter of a century has elapsed since the space now occupied by the Williams mansion and grounds, was an open, irregular hill-side, over whose rugged surface troops of children, as they issued from the school-room, were seen to scatter in their various sports, like flocks of sheep spreading over the hills.

In the year 1795, the old school-house, a low, red building of one room, with a garret above, entered by a flight of stairs and a trap door, where refractory pupils were committed for punishment; and with desks and benches, which, though made of solid oak, were desperately marred by ink and knife; was abandoned, and the school removed to a larger building of brick, erected for its accommodation in the highway, south of the court-house, where it fulfilled another period of its history, of nearly forty years. Here the chair of instruction, or more properly *the throne*, for the government was despotic, was

1 This is supposed to have been the place where stood the house of Charles Hill, fortified in the time of the Indian war. The present house was built by Samuel Fosdick, at the head of Niantic River, but taken apart, brought into town, and erected in 1786. It has been occupied by J. P. Trott, its present owner, more than half a century.

occupied, after 1800, by Dr. Dow, the number of whose subjects usually amounted to about 150, though sometimes rising to 200.

In 1833, a new and much superior edifice was erected for the grammar-school, on a lot south of the Second Congregational Church, chiefly through the exertions and liberality of Joseph Hurlbut, to whom a vote of thanks was rendered by the town, October 9th, 1833. In this building the Bartlet, or grammar-school is still continued under the care of the town, but the fund is inadequate to its support and the pupils are taxed to supply the deficiency.

The most noted teachers of this school since 1750, those whose office covered the longest term of years, were John Owen¹ and Ulysses Dow; both were peculiar characters, and each remained in office nearly forty years. The former died in 1801, aged sixty-five; the latter in 1844, aged seventy-eight.

The Union School was an establishment incorporated by the General Assembly, in October, 1774. The petition for the act was signed by twelve proprietors, who state that they had "built a commodious school-house, and for several years past hired and supported a school-master." The original proprietors were,

Richard Law,	Robinson Mumford,
Jeremiah Miller,	Joseph Christophers,
Duncan Stewart,	Marvin Wait,
Silas Church,	Thomas Mumford,
Thomas Allen,	Nathaniel Shaw, Jr.,
John Richards,	Roger Gibson.

This school was intended to furnish facilities for a thorough English education and the classical preparation necessary for entering college. The school-house stood on State Street, and by the subsequent opening of Union Street, was made a corner lot. This was a noted school in its early days, yielding a larger income than ordinary schools, and the station of preceptor regarded as a post of honor. It has been heretofore stated that Nathan Hale held that office in 1775, and that he left the school to enter the army. He was the first preceptor after the act of incorporation. A few only of his successors can be named. Seth Williston, a graduate of Dartmouth College, and since known as a divine of considerable eminence, was in charge

1 The remains of "Master Owen," were laid in the second burial ground, but no memorial stone marks the spot. If a sufficient number of his old pupils are yet upon the stage of life, to undertake the charge, it would be a creditable enterprise for them to unite and raise some simple but fitting monument to his memory. He was for many years both town and city clerk.

for two years. Jacob B. Gurley from the same seminary, succeeded Williston in May, 1794, and was the principal for three years.¹ Ebenezer Learned, a native of the town, and a graduate of Yale College,² filled the chair of instruction in 1799. Knight, of the Medical College, of New Haven, Olmsted, of Yale, Mitchell, of the University of North Carolina, and many other names of note, are among the teachers after 1800.

The school-house was taken down and the land sold after 1830, and in 1833, a reorganization took place; a new charter was obtained, and a brick school-house or academy built on Huntington Street. Here the school flourished for a few years, but could not be long sustained. The Bartlet and common schools gathered in the great mass of pupils; the number wishing to pursue a more extensive system of education was small, and the Union School, an old and venerated establishment, was discontinued. In 1851, the building was sold to the Bethel Society, by whom it has been converted into a commodious house of worship.

No provision seems to have been made for the education of females in any thing but needle-work, reading, writing, and the first principles of arithmetic, until the year 1799. A female academy was then built by a company of proprietors, in Green Street, and incorporated by the legislature. It continued in operation, with some intervals of recess, about thirty years. The property was sold and the company dissolved in 1834. A new female academy was built the same year, on Broad Street, and the system of instruction commenced by Rev. Daniel Huntington. This institution has hitherto met with fair encouragement. Since 1841, it has been in charge of H. P. Farnsworth, principal. The pupils are arranged in two departments, and for a few years past the average number has been about eighty.

In December, 1849, Leonard Bulkley, the last survivor of the family of Capt. Charles Bulkley, and a descendant of Rev. Gershom Bulkley, second minister of the town, left the bulk of his estate, to certain trustees, to found a free school for boys. By the provisions of the will, the benefit was to be limited to residents of New London, and to pupils between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one years, and the fund was not to be used until it should amount to \$50,000. The actual value at the period of the testator's decease, was less than half this sum.

¹ Mr. Gurley is a native of Mansfield, Conn., but since 1794, a resident of New London, where he began to practice as an attorney in 1797.

² Mr. Learned was then but nineteen years of age.

The fire of the 6th of September, 1781, had cleared a considerable space near the central border of the town plot, where the public buildings had stood. This space had been originally reserved for the use of a fortification, and was called fort land ; but not only the old fort, magazine and barracks had stood thereon, but also the court-house, jail, jail-house and town pump. The jail was rebuilt by the water-side, in 1782 ;¹ but in August, 1785, a city vote was passed to lay out the remainder as highway, that is, all east of a line drawn from the corner of Bradley to the corner of Bank Street, "excepting only the land within said limits belonging to Harvey Piriou and Bath-sheba his wife."² This space, if left open, would form a public square or parade, with its shortest line on the west, twelve rods in length ; and the subsequent purchase of the church land yet further west, narrowing the slope on that side, would have left a beautiful, open ground, spreading like a fan to the water.

Unfortunately, the next year this vote was reconsidered, and it was decided to lease out certain portions of this old fort land, for the site of shops ; the rent to be applied in the first instance to the building of a sea-wall on the eastern border of the land, to prevent it from washing away. The ground taken up by these leases was that which had been occupied by the ancient prison and the dwelling-house of the keeper, and it is still covered by buildings that pay a ground-rent to the town.³ In 1785, a market-house was built on the public land, and in 1794, a wharf constructed east of it for a ferry wharf. In 1816, the market was removed and built over the water between the wharf and jail ; it was burnt down in 1848, and has not been rebuilt.

" At a City meeting holden March 21st, 1793—Voted, that the committee appointed to make enquiry relative to the purchase of a lot for a burying-ground, viz. Messrs, Samuel Wheat, David Manwaring, and Richard W. Parkin, be empowered and directed to purchase Capt. Melally's lot at the price of £120, and to take a deed thereof to the city."

This is now the second burial-ground. The purchase-money was partly raised by a tax of four pence on the pound on the list of polls

¹ The jail was removed in 1846, and the land sold ; now covered by Holt's brick stores.

² The Piriou property consisted of a house, and the land of the breadth of the house, directly east of the old prison, now owned by John Dennis.

³ The last lease was to John Brandegee, and to run from May 24th, 1835, to May 24th, 1855.

and ratable estate of the inhabitants, and the deficiency supplied out of the ground rents of the city. An attempt had been made the previous year to pay for the lot by individual subscription, but the sum raised being wholly inadequate, the subscription was relinquished. The first person interred in this ground was Mary, relict of Thomas Rice, who died May 19th, 1793. The fact is recorded upon her gravestone.

In this ground were originally interred the remains of Bishop Seabury, which have been removed to the vault of the new church; of Gen. Jedidiah Huntington, removed afterward to the family tomb at Norwich, in accordance with a request contained in his will; of Hon. Richard Law, district judge of Connecticut, and his sons, Capt. Richard Law, and Hon. Lyman Law, member of Congress; of Brig.-Gen. Burbeck and of Captains Elisha Hinman and Nicoll Fosdick; all which have been removed since 1851, to the Cedar Grove Cemetery.

Many interesting monuments, bearing honored names, still remain in the ground, and a throng of graves with names less known, or nameless, but dear as life-blood to the inhabitants of the place.¹ The marble monument to the memory of Anthony Thatcher—a cubic pedestal, tastefully decorated and surmounted with a fluted circular shaft—is a beautiful production of art. A modest stone by the eastern wall, which bears the name of Ruth Pomham, an aged Indian woman, known as “the Pequot of a hundred years,” is not without a peculiar interest. And near the center of the ground is the hallowed grave of John G. C. Brainard, a man of rich poetic intellect, who is ranked among the undying poets of America. He was a native of New London, and died in the arms of his brothers, in the family homestead, Sept. 26th, 1828, aged thirty-two years. His head-stone has no epitaph but the record of his death, and the beautiful quotation, “John xi. 33—Thy brother shall rise again.”

The public ground on which the first meeting-house and the first court-house had stood, was in 1794 laid out for a highway, and was then familiarly called “the old meeting-house green.” It was recorded of the following dimensions: south line, twenty-eight rods; north, twenty-three rods and seventeen links; east, thirty-three rods

¹ In this ground there are forty-two gravestones bearing the name of *Coit*, and forty that of *Rogers*.

and twelve links ; west, thirteen rods and eight links. On this green in the year 1800, the present alms-house was built, the expense of erection being liquidated jointly by the town and by private subscription. The amount raised by individuals was one thousand dollars, and the number of subscribers one hundred and sixteen, comprising very nearly all the substantial householders of the place. The former alms-house (at the corner of Truman and Blinman Streets) was sold in 1773, and the poor of the town had been afterward supported by contract, at an annual expense varying from £150 to £200. It was then proposed to purchase a house and farm in the country, and place the poor in a situation where they might contribute to their own support. This project was kept in discussion for several years, but ultimately abandoned. The new alms-house was erected under the direction of the selectmen ; the material, brick, and the dimensions thirty-six feet by forty-four. It was at first denominated a "Poor and Bettering House," to be, according to the act of incorporation,

"A home for the poor, and also a work-house and place of detention for roguees, vagabonds, sturdy beggars, idle, dissolute and disorderly persons, runaways, stubborn children and servants, common drunkards, night-walkers, pilferers, and all persons who neglect their callings, misspend what they earn, and do not provide support for themselves and families ; also all persons under distraction whose friends or relations do not confine them."

In the year 1807, a survey of the city was made, and a map of it drawn by Moses Warren, deputy surveyor of the county. The streets were relaid, and all those that were without names in common use, had names affixed to them by the city authorities. A few brief facts that have been collected in regard to the streets, will be here introduced.

State Street has been subjected to great fluctuation in regard to its name. The eastern part was first known as Fort Hill, but since the Revolution, has generally borne the name of the Parade. West of this, when the Episcopal church stood here, it was sometimes called Church Street, and sometimes Broad Street. In some deeds of the date of 1777, it is called King Street, and again in deeds ten years later in date, Congress Street. After the court-house was built at the head of it, the common appellation was Court Street. The city government, in 1807, ordered it to be registered as State Street. The continuation of this street at the north-west, (now *Broad*,) was surveyed in 1753, and was then, between the Hallam

and Fosdick lots, to Hempstead Street, only two rods and a half wide.

Bank Street, was in former times, *the Bank*. An attempt was made about the year 1804, to change its name to Thames Street, but it failed.

Water Street was laid out in 1733, "two rods wide from the fort to the town wharf," and was called Beach Street till 1822, when the name was changed by a city vote.

Shapley Street was opened in 1747, by Daniel Shapley, through his homestead lot, which was then divided into six tenements.

Hill Street was opened in 1752, by Joshua Raymond and John Colfax, through what was called "Hill's north lot;" that is, a lot that had been owned by Charles Hill, an early settler.

Federal Street was opened in 1784, and called Pleasant Street for the first six years. The western part, from Huntington to Hempstead, was opened in 1840, by Hezekiah Goddard and Robert Coit.

Church Street was opened in 1787 to Union, and at first called Wait Street, in compliment to Marvin Wait. In 1801 it was continued to Huntington.

Union Street was opened in 1786, from State Street north, by the side of the Congregational church, through the land of Stephen Bolles; who opened Masonic Street at the same time. It must be observed that most of the present names of the streets were not conferred till 1807. Masonic Street received its name from the Mason's Hotel, built on its north-west corner in 1799, by the trustees of Union Lodge, No. 31, and sold to W. P. Cleveland in 1808.¹ Union Street takes its name from the Union school-house, that stood at the corner, on the south side of State Street.

Golden Street, opened after the burning of the town, owes its name to a house of entertainment built by Nathan Douglas at the head of it, and known by the sign of a golden ball. The ascent at this place was abrupt, and the summit called Golden Hill.

Pearl Street was laid out in 1784. At the head of it where it joins Union, lay an irregular mass of outlying rocks, where people resorted for the sake of the prospect, and children to pursue their sports, or to look for the prints of enormous feet, and the wonderful stone cradle, which were said to exist among the rocks. Upon this

¹ Now Orrin F. Smith's.

ledge the Baptist church is built.¹ Here and along the line of Union Street, the solid rock has been excavated, deep cuts made, the hills split, the neighborhood shaken by concussions, and innumerable loads of stone removed, until the Baptist rocks are nameless, and Golden Hill almost a level.

Methodist Street was originally very precipitous in its descent, and was appropriately called Valley Street. It was extended in 1804, and the present name applied to it; the Methodist chapel having been built at its commencement on Golden Hill.

Coit Street was formerly Cove Street.

Tilley Street was opened by James Tilley, forty-one feet wide, in 1804, and called by him Union Street, but when accepted by the city, it received its present name.

Brewer Street was opened through the Picket lot, and was intended for Picket Street, but obtained its present name from an old brewery at one corner of it.

Blinman Street is appropriately named, after the first minister of the town.

Green Street, to Golden, was laid out in 1787, principally through the land of Timothy Green.

In 1800, the Erving lot, (owned by George W. Erving,) was divided into thirty building-lots. Two streets through it were laid out, viz., a continuation of Church Street, and Winthrop, now called Meridian Street, a name derived from its course, which is due north and south.

John Street was originally a precipitous hill, known at different periods by the names prevalent in its neighborhood, Jeffrey's Hill, Bailey's Hill, &c. Its present name was probably derived from John Woodward and John Wood. The former built a brick house in this street in 1800, which in 1807 was purchased by the latter.

Potter Street was opened in 1798, principally through the land of Mrs. Abigail Potter.

Washington Street was laid out in 1829, by Hezekiah Goddard and Increase Wilson.

Jay Street, which is a continuation of Truman to Huntington, was opened in 1838.

¹ We may here notice a fact which was accidentally omitted in treating of the First Baptist Church. The *bell* of this church was once a convent bell in the island of St. Domingo, and was obtained on the breaking up of a nunnery in 1794, and brought to New London by Capt. Samuel Hurlbut, when it was first purchased by the Episcopal church. It is small, but pleasing in tone.

Ashcraft Street derives its name from a family that resided near the head of it in Cape Ann Street. William Ashcraft, a brave revolutionary soldier, died here in 1845, at the age of ninety-four.

Williams Street has had different names for different parts of it ; Post Hill, Pound Street, Manwaring's Hill, &c. As a whole, its name is recent, and bestowed in compliment to T. W. Williams.

Vauxhall Street was formerly the old Colchester road, but derives its present name from a house built by Thaddeus Brooks, and used as a place of resort for refreshments, suppers, clubs and other parties.

The first marked improvements in the streets of the city, commenced with Bank Street in 1844.

State Street was graded in 1847, under the limitation of cutting down no more than four feet at the intersection of Union Street, and filling in no more than three feet at any one point.

Main Street was leveled and otherwise repaired, in 1848. These were great and manifest improvements.

November 4th, 1807, Harry Niles was hung for the murder of his wife. The gallows was erected in the highway, at the head of Granite Street, and it was calculated that ten thousand spectators covered the adjacent fields and heights. Sermon by Rev. Abel McEwen, who took the opportunity to preach on the subject of temperance ; the crime for which the unhappy man suffered having been the result of intoxication. Harry was a Narragansett Indian, with a quarter cross of African blood—a large, fine looking fellow, in the prime of life, belonging to the Indian reservation in North Stonington. In his mind and character there was something noble and independent in its stamp. He had been well taught and trained in the family from which he received his name, but unfortunately was not proof against the temptation of the white man's fire water, and in a drunken fight with his wife on their way home from the market where he had obtained the pernicious draught, he inflicted blows upon her which caused her death. In his religious views he was independent, wild, and speculative, and during his imprisonment deemed that he had various inspired dreams and revelations, teaching him the right way, and assuring him of his ultimate safety.

This was the fourth and last public execution in the town. The avenging stroke of justice has fallen upon one other criminal, a man by the name of Sherman, who in a state of intoxication barbarously murdered his wife and infant child. The crime was committed in

Norwich, but the trial took place in New London, and the penalty was inflicted here, but without notoriety, in the shadow of the walls of the old prison that stood by the water-side, south of the market wharf.

Second War with Great Britain.

The second war with Great Britain, occupying the space between the two proclamations of President Madison, June 18th, 1812, declaring war, and February 18th, 1815, proclaiming peace, by no means includes the whole period in which the commerce of the United States was interrupted. Perplexity and distress began much earlier. In 1805 and 1806, the belligerent powers of Europe preyed upon American vessels. New London, however, suffered less from this source than most other ports, and the tide of a prosperous trade came up to the shores, until suddenly stopped by the embargo act, Dec. 22d, 1807.

In 1812, it was noted that the whole civilized world was in a state of warfare. This had not been the case before for many generations. On the fourth of December, Commodore Decatur, in the frigate United States, came into the harbor, followed by his prize, the Macedonian, which he had captured Oct. 25th, in latitude 30°, longitude 26°.¹ The arrival of these ships was like the lifting of a curtain that opened New London to the scene of war. It was her first act of participation in the conflict. In April, 1813,² a formidable British fleet made its appearance in the Sound; a pageant once familiar to the eyes of the inhabitants, but which for more than thirty years they had not witnessed. The British standard was erected on Block Island, while Sir Thomas Hardy, in the flag-ship Ramillies, and the Orpheus,³ (Sir Hugh Pigot,) with other vessels, cruised along the coast. Sir Thomas Hardy soon acquired among the inhabitants an enviable reputation for courtesy and humanity. He released some vessels, allowed others to be ransomed, paid kind attentions to prisoners, and pledged his word that fishermen should not be disturbed.

1 The action lasted seventeen minutes. Americans killed and wounded, twelve. British, one hundred and four.

2 April 18th, arrived in port, the ship Superior, H. I. Champlin, in the short passage of twenty-two days from Cadiz. Off Montauk, was boarded by the Eolus, thirty-two guns, (Lord Townsend,) and permitted to proceed. *Gazette.*

3 Capt. Hosmer, of Norwich, was taken by the Orpheus, as he was returning from Cuba, after an absence of five years, but was exchanged with about forty others, and landed May 2d.

Liberal payment was made for supplies taken from the coast or islands of the Sound, and parties landing for refreshment, refrained entirely from plunder.¹

On the 1st of June, an American squadron consisting of the frigates United States and Macedonian, and the sloop-of-war Hornet, came through the Sound from New York, hoping to slip out to sea by Montauk, the passage at Sandy Hook being narrowly watched by the enemy, but were arrested near the entrance of the Sound by two seventy-fours and a frigate, which gave chase and pursued them into New London harbor. The enemy followed as far as Gull Island, and then anchored so as to command the mouth of the river. This was the commencement of a regular blockade of the port, which was unintermittent during the remainder of the war, nearly twenty-one months.

In a few days the squadron of the enemy was augmented to a considerable fleet, consisting of two ships of the line, two frigates, and a number of smaller vessels. The aged inhabitants who remembered the arrival of Arnold's fleet, on the morning of September 6th, 1781, shuddered with apprehension lest the tragic realities of that day should be acted over again. It was generally expected that the enemy would enter the river, and attack the American squadron. The neighboring militia were summoned to the coast, the specie of the banks was conveyed to Norwich, and the city emptied of women, children, and the more valuable portable goods. The character of Sir Thomas Hardy was relied on as a guarantee that no wanton destruction of life or property would be allowed, but in case of a bombardment of the ships, the burning of the town would almost necessarily follow. Major Simeon Smith, of New London, with a company of volunteers, repaired to the old fort in Groton, where hasty but vigorous preparations were made to cannonade the enemy.² The

1 June 9th, a party landed at Black Hall, and amused themselves awhile on the shore; then visited Mrs. Griswold, asked for some refreshments, behaved with civility, and soon retired. While the fleet lay upon the coast, it was ascertained that a young American, named John Carpenter, was an impressed seaman, on board the Ramillies, where he had served five years. He belonged to Norwich, and contrived to let his friends know of his situation. His father went off to the vessel with a flag, and the proper testimonials, in order to obtain, if possible, his release. An affecting scene took place, when the father and son met on the deck of the ship. Commodore Hardy expressed his sympathy, and the proper formalities having passed, he discharged the man.

2 The inhabitants of Groton village were all in confusion, removing their effects, when a messenger from the fort was sent among them to collect flannel to be used as

town was kept for several days in a state of anxiety and confusion, but the hostile ships, after several times displaying themselves in formidable array, as if bearing toward the harbor, chose their anchorage ground about five miles from the city. It was soon ascertained that the Valiant, seventy-four, and the Acasta, frigate, had relieved the Ramillies and the Orpheus. Commodore Oliver was in command of the station, and he executed his office with unsparing energy.

Alarms were now frequent. An increase of force, or change of position in the blockading squadron, would cause immediate apprehension; a signal gun from the fort was sufficient to set every living being in motion. It was rumored that spies were often in town under various disguises, and that suspicious persons appeared and disappeared strangely. The American ships had in the mean time retreated up the river, and being lightened, passed the bar at Gale's Ferry. Commodore Decatur threw up a light intrenchment on Allyn's Mountain, where he had a fine view of the Sound and harbor. His people called the place Dragon Hill.

In the latter part of June, Commodore Hardy, in the Ramillies, again took command of the station, having the Acasta and Maidstone frigates with him. A descent upon the coast, preparatory to an attack upon the ships, was seriously apprehended, and various preparations for defense were made.

About this time an affair took place which exasperated the officers of the blockading squadron, and embittered their subsequent intercourse with the people on the coast, although the latter had no agency in the offensive act. A schooner, called the Eagle, owned in New York, was prepared as a kind of torpedo vessel, and sent into the Sound to make an experiment upon the enemy. She had a show of naval stores on board, and was captured by the British, west of New London harbor, near Millstone Point. The crew took to their boats, and reached the shore in safety. The British officer, after taking possession of the schooner, attempted to tow her up to the Ramillies, but finding that she fell to leeward, he anchored at the distance of three-fourths of a mile from that vessel. Suddenly, in less than three

wadding for the guns. Most of the portable goods having been sent off, he was unsuccessful in his search, until he encountered Mrs. Anna Bailey, a warm-hearted, prompt and impulsive woman, who instantly divested herself of her flannel petticoat, and heartily devoted it to the cause. It was carried to the fortress, displayed at the end of a pike, and the story told to the garrison, who cheered the banner with great enthusiasm. "The Martial Petticoat" and its partisan donor have ever since been renowned in our local annals. Mrs. Anna Bailey died January 10th, 1861, aged ninety-two years.

hours after the desertion of her crew, and her seizure by the British, the Eagle exploded with prodigious force, and was scattered into fragments. A shower of pitch and tar fell upon the Ramillies; timber and stones were hurled aloft, and the waters around thrown into great commotion. A second lieutenant and ten men, who were on board the schooner, were killed, and several men in boats were badly wounded.

This was wholly a private undertaking; the government had nothing to do with it. The owners had fitted the Eagle as a fire-ship, with a secret piece of mechanism concealed within, which, when set in motion, would cause an explosion after a certain interval. Her hold, under the appearance of ballast, contained 400 pounds of powder, and various other combustibles, with ponderous stones and destructive implements, sufficient to inflict a terrible blow upon any ship of war, along side of which she might be brought, a blow which the Ramillies barely escaped.

The next morning Commodore Hardy sent a flag of truce up to the town, with the following communication:

"To Jirah Isham, Brig.-Gen. commanding at New London. I am under the necessity of requesting you to make it publicly known that I can not permit vessels or boats of any description, (flags of truce of course excepted,) to approach or pass the British squadron, in consequence of an American vessel having exploded yesterday, three hours after she was in our possession."

Toward the end of June, Major-General Henry Burbeck arrived in town from Newport, and assumed the military command of the district, which had been transferred from the state to the general government. The troops on duty, amounting to about 1,000, belonged to the militia of the state, and were under no orders but of the governor. A change was now to be made, and on the 12th of July, agreeably to an order from the secretary of war, General Burbeck dismissed the whole force. The town was thus left suddenly without a soldier on duty. Forts Trumbull and Griswold were completely evacuated; the latter had not even a man on watch from noon till ten P. M. This, of itself, was sufficient to cause a panic among the inhabitants, but simultaneously it was discovered that the British squadron had been augmented, and that no less than seven ships of the line and frigates lay near the entrance of the Sound, inside of Block Island. The same day also, it happened that the Ramillies and her consort, at the mouth of the harbor, took occasion to exercise their guns, and kept up for a time an incessant and spirited discharge of cannon. Never were the citizens more completely frantic with fear,

nor ever perhaps more exasperated. The misconception was even worse than the tumult, for the inhabitants thought themselves betrayed by the government, and purposely left to be destroyed. In order to calm the public excitement, General Burbeck, on his own responsibility, applied to the governor for a temporary force, who authorized Brigadier-General Williams to call out as large a body of militia as exigencies should demand.

The blockade was henceforth of the most rigorous character. The enemy resolved to leave nothing afloat. The Sound was alive with petty warfare. Every creek, bay and river were searched, and nothing in the form of boat, sloop or smack suffered to live. Yankee enterprise prolonged the task of the invaders, and obliged them to destroy by inches, and to multiply and repeat the blows, before they could ruin all traffic, and clear the coast of sails and oars. Sometimes a sloop or schooner would be chased ashore by the enemy, and the inhabitants would collect to defend it. This was always the occasion of great, and apparently hilarious excitement in the neighborhood. In Mystic harbor, a spirited affair of this nature occurred on the 12th of June. One sloop had been destroyed, and another, the Victory, was attacked, but the enemy were driven off after a warm action of fifteen minutes, by a party of about twenty Mystic men, under the command of Jeremiah Haley. Another shore skirmish took place November 28th, west of the light-house, New London. The sloop Roxana was chased aground by three British barges, and in half an hour a throng of people assembled to the rescue. The enemy set fire to the sloop and retreated, but the Americans determined to extinguish the flames, and were only kept from accomplishing their purpose by a heavy cannonade from the ships. The Rogers farm was ploughed by their balls, but though many upon the shore were much exposed, no damage was done to life or limb.

During the whole war not a man was killed by the enemy in Connecticut, and only one¹ in its waters upon the coast. The fact is a striking one, considering the long period that the blockading squadron lay in the Sound, and the numerous encounters between the parties.

Commodore Decatur had strong hopes that during the winter some opportunity would occur of getting his ships to sea. He determined to be ready to take advantage of the enemy's unguarded hour, if such

¹ That one was Mr. Dolph, of Saybrook, who was killed in January, 1815, while engaged with others in recovering two prizes taken by the British, off Saybrook.

an hour should come. He began therefore in October, to drop down the river, and by the last of November was anchored in the harbor, opposite Market wharf. Though no uncommon movement was made and great care was taken not to attract notice, every thing was put in complete readiness for sailing. As far as possible, silence and secrecy were to be observed. Not even friends were to be trusted, except from the necessity of the case. The night of the 12th of December was fixed for the attempt. The day came; it was Sunday; the night proved to be dark, the wind favorable, and when the tide served they were to start. Just at this critical time, some few hours before they expected to weigh anchor and make sail, at different times between eight and ten o'clock, *blue lights* appeared on the shore, both sides of the river, upon Groton Height, and near the harbor's mouth. These were supposed to be *signals*, made by persons on land; *traitors*, who had by some means become acquainted with the design of the American squadron, and exhibited these lights to apprise the enemy, and set them on their guard. Commodore Decatur, on hearing of these signals, instantly relinquished his plan of sailing, and indignant at being betrayed by his countrymen, made no subsequent attempt to escape.

The whole affair was made public, the design and the cause of its failure; but the story was not received by all with entire confidence. Many persons gave no credence to what was said of the blue lights, and averred that accidental lights kindled by fishermen, or the gleams from country windows, or reflections from the heavens upon water, had been mistaken for treasonable signals. We had no such traitors on shore; the American officers felt that the causes of their inaction had been misconstrued by the citizens; they had been reproached for idleness, and accused of timidity in suffering themselves to be so long shut up in a corner, and this tale was either fabricated for the purpose, or caught up eagerly, as it dropped from the idle tongue of rumor, and circulated in order to sustain their reputation with the public. This was the explanation made by one party.

On the other side it was stated that the blue lights were distinctly seen and reported, by officers and men stationed on the look-out, or belonging to the row-guard both of the Macedonian and the Hornet, people who were familiar with signals, and would not have mistaken the common lights of the shore for blue lights.

At this distance of time nothing more can be added; no further light has been thrown upon the subject. No fact has ever been disclosed which would fix the stigma of treason upon any person in the

vicinity; no charge of bribery or of secret intercourse with the enemy has been attached to the name of any individual. Yet it is evident that Commodore Decatur and Captains Jones and Biddle believed that signals were actually made to the British by traitorous persons on shore, in consequence of a report which had crept abroad that the American vessels would make an attempt to get out to sea before morning.

Early the next spring the American squadron again withdrew up the Thames; the two larger vessels were dismantled and laid up about three and a half miles below Norwich Landing, with only a guard left on board. The Hornet remained at New London, and November 18th, 1814, slipped out of the harbor and reached New York in safety.

It is worthy of note that the packet sloop Juno, Capt. John Howard, continued to ply back and forth between New London and New York, during the whole war. Had her compass and helm been charmed to guide her safely, she could scarcely have performed her trips with better success. Once indeed she was driven into Saybrook, and her mast shot away, but this was her only serious disaster. Her enterprising commander generally chose a dark night in which to leave the harbor and run through the blockading squadron, and as no shore lights were then allowed, he steered his course by the lantern lights that the enemy kept at the stern of their vessels. Often he went out or came in under cover of falling rain, or driving snow. He had four pieces of cannon on deck, and kept well supplied with shot, but confined himself strictly to a defensive course, pursuing steadily his way, and never firing a gun except in case of an attack. He was narrowly watched by the British, who easily obtained all the newspapers published on the coast, and could ascertain with tolerable accuracy, his periods of departure and return. Several times he was waylaid or pursued by their boats and barges, but a spirited discharge of his guns always succeeded in driving them away, and in several critical periods, when he found himself in peril from the larger vessels of the enemy, a favorable wind and a turn of the tide assisted his escape. This very fact, that the Juno continually eluded their grasp, made the British more desirous of putting an end to her career, and rendered her ultimate escape the more remarkable.

When the news of peace arrived in February, 1815, Admiral Hotcham, of the Superb, commanded the blockading squadron off New London. On the 21st February, the city was illuminated. The parole that day on board the Superb, was *America*; countersign, *Amity*.

The British officers now came frequently on shore, and mingled cordially with the citizens. Admiral Hotham, when he first landed, was received with great courtesy by the civil authorities, and an assemblage of citizens. The Pactolus and Narcissus came into the Sound, and joining the Superb, landed Commodore Decatur and Lieut. Shubrick, who had been captured in the frigate President.

A public reception, partaking of the nature of a ball and festival, was held at the court-house, in celebration of the peace, to which all the British officers on the coast received a general invitation. Those present were Captains Aylmer of the Pactolus, Garland of the Superb, Gordon of the Narcissus, and Jayne of the Arab; the commanders of the brigs Tenedos and Despatch, and ten or twelve officers of inferior rank. The American commodores Decatur and Shaw assisted in receiving these guests.

On the 11th of March, the Superb got under way, followed by the remainder of the fleet, and exchanging salutes with Fort Trumbull, passed off toward Montauk and put out to sea. In April, the frigates United States and Macedonian, that had long been lying in reluctant idleness, came down the river, and sailed for New York in charge of Commodore Shaw. The last shadow of war passed away from the town.

Brig.-Gen. Henry Burbeck, the military commander of the New London district, retired from the army at the close of the war, and fixing his residence in the place, passed the evening of his days in happy tranquillity. He had spent thirty-eight years in the service, having been a captain of artillery in the Revolutionary War. He died October 2d, 1848, aged ninety-four. An obelisk has been erected to his memory in the new Cedar Grove Cemetery, near New London, by the Massachusetts Society of Cincinnati, of which, at the period of his decease, he was the president, and the last survivor but one of the original members of that society.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Early allusions to whaling in Connecticut.—General progress of whaling from the American coast.—Enterprise of Sag Harbor.—Various attempts in New London between 1794 and 1803.—Progress after 1819.—Fate of some of the earliest ships.—Successful captains and remarkable voyages.—Statistics of whaling.—Adventures to California.

In tracing the whale fishery, so far as it has been prosecuted by the people of Connecticut, back to its rise, we come to the following resolve of the General Court at Hartford, May 25th, 1647:

"If Mr. Whiting with any others shall make trial and prosecute a design for the taking of whale, within these liberties, and if upon trial within the term of two years, they shall like to go on, no others shall be suffered to interrupt them for the term of seven years."¹

The granting of monopolies and exclusive privileges was the customary mode of encouraging trade and manufactures in that day. Of Mr. Whiting's project nothing further is known. Whales, in the early years of the colony, were often seen in the Sound; and if one chanced to be stranded on the shore, or to get embayed in a creek, the news was soon spread, and the fishermen and farmers from the nearest settlements would turn out, armed with such implements as they possessed, guns, pikes, pitchforks, or spears, and rush to the encounter. Such adventures, however, belong more particularly to the south side of Long Island than to the Connecticut shore.

A *whale boat* is mentioned in an enumeration of goods before the end of the seventeenth century, and this implies that excursions were sometimes made in pursuit of whales,² but probably they were not ex-

¹ Colonial Records, vol. 1, p. 154.

² The following memorandum implies that such whaling trips were not unusual. January 18th, 1717-18. "Comfort Davis hath hired my whale boat to go a whaling to Fisher's Island, till the 20th of next month, to pay twenty shillings for her hire, and if he stays longer, thirty shillings. If she be lost, and they get nothing, he is to pay me £8, but if they get a fish, £3, 10s." [Hempstead.]

tended much beyond Montauk. Even at the present day a whale sometimes makes its appearance in the eastern part of the Sound.¹

We have no statistics to show that the whale fishery was carried on except in this small way, from any part of the Connecticut coast, before the Revolutionary War. At Sagharbor, on the opposite coast of the Sound, something more had been done. It is said that as far back as 1760, sloops from that place went to Disco Island in pursuit of whales; but of these *voyages* no record has been preserved.

The progress of whaling from the American coast appears to have been pursued in the following order:²

1st. Whales were killed on or near the coast, and in all instances cut up and dried upon land. Boats only used.

2d. Small sloops were fitted out for a cruise of five or six weeks, and went as far as the Great Bank of Newfoundland.

3d. Longer voyages of a few months were made to the Western Islands, Cape Verde, West Indies and Gulf of Mexico.

4th: After 1745, voyages were made to Davis' Straits, Baffin's Bay, and as far south as the coast of Guinea.

5th. After 1770, voyages were made to the Brazil Banks, and before 1775, vessels both from Nantucket and Newport had been to the Falkland Islands. Nantucket alone had at that time 150 vessels, and 2,000 men, employed in the whaling business.³ Some of the vessels were brigs of considerable burden.

The war totally destroyed the whale fishery, and the depression of business after the war prevented it from being immediately resumed. In Nantucket, it revived in 1785, under legislative encouragement. This brings us to the period when the first whaling expedition into south latitude was fitted out from Long Island Sound.

In the year 1784, we find the following notice in the *New London Gazette*:

" May 20. Sailed from this port, sloop *Rising Sun*, Squire, on a whaling voyage."

Of this voyage there is no further record; it was probably of the short description. At Sagharbor,⁴ a more extended expedition was

¹ In June, 1850, a whale, thirty-five feet long, was captured in Peconic Bay, near Greenport.

² See *History of Nantucket*, by Obed Macy.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁴ Sagharbor was made a port of entry in 1790; until that period it appears to have been included in the custom-house district of New London. *History of Long Island*, by N. S. Prime, p. 210.

undertaken the same year. Nathaniel Gardiner and brother fitted out both a ship and a brig on a whaling adventure. They were both unsuccessful,¹ but this is supposed to have been the first expedition after whales from Long Island Sound into *south latitudes*. In 1785, Messrs. Stephen Howell and Benjamin Hunting, of Sag Harbor, purchased the brig *Lucy*, of Elijah Hubbard, of Middletown, Conn.,² and sent her out on a whaling voyage, George McKay, master. The same season, the brig *America*, Daniel Havens, master, was fitted out from the same place. Both went to the Brazil Banks.

1785. The *Lucy* returned May 15th, with 360 barrels.

“ The *America* returned June 4th, with 300 barrels.

These arrivals were announced in the New London Gazette, in the marine list kept by Thomas Allen, who thereupon breaks forth:

“ Now, my horse jockeys, beat your horses and cattle into spears, lances, harpoons and whaling gear, and let us all strike out: many spouts ahead! Whales plenty, you have them for catching.”

The first vessel sailing from New London on a whaling voyage to a southern latitude, was the ship *Commerce*, which was owned and fitted out at East Haddam, in Connecticut River, but cleared from New London, Feb. 6th, 1794.³ An attempt was made to form a whaling company in New London in 1795, and a meeting called at Miner's tavern for that purpose, but it led to no result. Norwich next came forward, and sent out on a whaling voyage a small new ship built in the Thames River, below Norwich, and called the *Miantinomoh*. She sailed from New London, Sept. 5th, 1800, (Capt. Swain,) and passing round Cape Horn, was reported at Massafuero, Aug. 9th, 1801. She spent another year on the South American coast, but in April, 1802, was seized at Valparaiso by the Spanish authorities, and condemned—the ship *Tryal*, Coffin, of Nantucket, sharing the same fate.

In 1802, the ship *Despatch*, Howard, was fitted out at New London, to cruise in the south seas, after whales; but the voyage was not repeated. The year 1805, may therefore be considered as the period when the whaling business actually commenced in the place,

1 Prime, in the History of Long Island, says that the ship sent out was the *Hope*, Capt. Ripley, and observes, “the ship returned with only thirty barrels of oil, and the brig with still less;” but Green's Gazette, of June 6th, 1785, has the following—“Arr. at Sag Harbor, brig ——, Ripley, from the coast of Brazil, with 140 barrels of oil.”

2 Letter of Luther D. Cook, of Sag Harbor, to T. W. Williams, of New London.

3 The ship *Commerce* was afterward in the West India trade, and was lost at Cape Henry, Dec. 25th, 1799.

and the ship *Dauphin* the pioneer in the trade. This vessel was built by Capt. John Barber, at Pawcatuck Bridge, with express reference to the whale fishery. Her burden was two hundred and forty tons, and when completed, she was filled with wood and sent to New York for sale. Not meeting with a purchaser, she returned and came into New London Harbor in the autumn of 1804. Here a company was formed, chiefly through the exertions of Dr. S. H. P. Lee, the first mover in the enterprise, who bought the ship and fitted her for whaling.

The *Dauphin*, Capt. Laban Williams, sailed for the Brazil Banks, Sept. 6th, 1805, and arrived with her cargo, June 14th, 1806. Dr. Lee then bought the ship *Leonidas*, in New York, and fitted her also for whaling. Both ships sailed in August; Williams in the *Leonidas*, and Alexander Douglas in the *Dauphin*.

The *Dauphin* arrived in April, 1807, full.

The *Leonidas* arrived in June, 1807, 1,050 barrels

In 1807, the ship *Lydia* was bought in New York, and put into the business. The three ships went to the coast of Patagonia.

The *Lydia* (Douglas) arrived June 9th, 1808—1,000 barrels.

The *Dauphin* (Sayre) arrived June 13th, 1808—900 barrels.

The *Leonidas* (Wm. Barnes) arrived June 23d, 1808—1,200 barrels.

The *Leonidas* left six of her crew on the uninhabited island of Trinidad; they had landed for refreshment, and the weather becoming very boisterous, the wind blowing off from the island, and so continuing for many days, the vessel sailed without them. In July, the schooner *Experiment* (S. P. Fitch) was sent to bring them away.

The *Leonidas* (Douglas) sailed again Aug. 31st, 1808.

The embargo, non-intercourse and war, following close upon each other from this period, entirely broke up this, as well as every other species of commerce.

The West India trade, which in former times had been the source of so much wealth and prosperity to the town, was never again extensively revived. After the conclusion of peace, only a few vessels were engaged in that traffic, and every year diminished the number. The whale fishery seemed to offer itself to fill the void of this declining trade.

In 1819, the whaling business was commenced anew by T. W. Williams and Daniel Deshon; the first officers employed consisted principally of persons who had gained some experience in the former short period of the business between 1805 and 1808. The brig

Mary (James Davis) was sent out by Williams ; the brig *Mary Ann* (Inglis) and the ship *Carrier* (Alexander Douglas) by Deshon. The *Mary* came in the next season, June 7th, and brought the first results of the new enterprise. She was out ten months and twenty days, and brought in seven hundred and forty-four barrels of whale-oil, and seventy-eight of sperm. The *Carrier* brought nine hundred and twenty-eight barrels of whale ; the *Mary Ann* only fifty-nine.

In 1820, the brig *Pizarro* (Elias L. Coit) was added to the fleet, and in 1821, the brig *Thames* (Barnard) and the ship *Commodore Perry* (Davis.) The last named vessel was built in 1815, at East Greenwich, R. I., but coppered in New London, after she was engaged in the whaling business. It was the first time that this operation was performed in the place ; and the *Commodore Perry* was the first copper-bottomed whaling vessel sent from the port. On her first voyage, she was out eight months and four days, and brought in 1,544 of whale, and eighty-one of sperm.

The *Carrier*, (O. Swain,) 340 tons burden, was the first vessel from the port that went out on the long voyage for sperm whale. She sailed for the Pacific Ocean, Feb. 20th, 1821, and arrived July 12th, 1823, with 2,074 barrels. In November, 1821, sailed also for the Pacific, the new ship *Stonington*, (Ray,) built at Stonington, but sent from New London. In 1822, the ships *Connecticut*, *Ann Maria* and *Jones*, were added to the fleet, and in 1824, the *Neptune*. The four brigs and the ship *Carrier*, after making three and four voyages each, were withdrawn from the business ; and as no other vessels were added till 1827, at the commencement of that year, the whaling list of the port consisted of six ships only—three of them right whale and three sperm cruisers. Of these, five were fitted out by T. W. Williams ; and the *Commodore Perry* by N. and W. W. Billings, who were then just launching into the business, and who purchased, the same year, the *Superior* and the *Phenix*.

A fine ship, that has for many years braved the storms of ocean, can not be regarded with indifference. She has a history, which, if it could be written, would be full of interest. A few brief notes respecting the older ships belonging to the port, may therefore be acceptable.

The *Commodore Perry* made seventeen voyages, and the *Stonington* thirteen. They both gave out, and were broken up in 1848.

The *Connecticut* was condemned in a foreign port in 1848 ; was sold, and is still afloat in the Pacific Ocean. The *Ann Maria* was run down by a French whaler in the Indian Ocean, in 1842.

The Jones made sixteen voyages, and was condemned in 1842.

The Neptune and Superior, two ships that belong to the whaling fleet of New London at the present time, (1852,) were both built in 1808. The Superior was built in Philadelphia, and purchased by N. and W. W. Billings in 1827; the Neptune in New Bedford, and purchased by T. W. Williams in 1824, for \$1,650. She had just returned from an unsuccessful whaling voyage fitted out from New York, and being sixteen years old, the sum paid for her was considered fully equal to her value. She sailed on her first voyage from New London, June 7th, 1824, has made eighteen voyages, and is now absent, (1852,) on her nineteenth, having been forty-four years afloat. She has been more than once during that period rebuilt, but has not lost her identity; her keel, stern-post and some of her floor-timbers, belong to the original frame.

No other service admits of such rapid promotion as whaling. In 1821, Robert B. Smith went captain of the *Mary*. His experience in the business had been gained in two voyages only, but he proved to be one of the most successful and enterprising masters in the trade. He was the first to reach the amount of 2,000 barrels in one voyage, which he did in the *Ann Maria* in 1823, the second time that he went out commander. He was absent eight months and twenty-two days, and brought in 1,919 barrels of whale, and 145 of sperm. In his sixth voyage, he was unfortunately drowned in the Pacific Ocean, being drawn overboard by a whale, to which he had just made fast with his harpoon and line, Dec. 28th, 1828. Capt. Smith's four brothers pursued the same line of enterprise.

Capt. James Smith has made ten voyages as captain, and several of them have been eminently successful. In three successive voyages in the *Columbia*, made to the island of Desolation, from which he returned in 1840, 1842 and 1844, he brought in, each time, more than 4,000 barrels of oil.

Capt. Franklin Smith, another of the brothers, made the most successful series of voyages, to be found in the whaling annals of the port, and probably of the world! In seven voyages to the South Atlantic, in the employ of N. and W. W. Billings, and accomplished in seven successive years, from 1831 to 1837, inclusive—one in the *Flora*, one in the *Julius Cesar*, and five in the *Tuscarora*—he brought home 16,154 barrels of whale, 1,147 of sperm. This may be regarded as a brilliant exhibition of combined good fortune and skill. Two subsequent voyages made by him in the *Chelsea*, were also crowned with

signal success. These nine voyages were accomplished between June, 1830, and August, 1841.

Capt. John Rice was one of the crew of the brig *Mary*, in 1819, and sailed commander of the *Pizarro*, June 9th, 1822. He is still in the service, (1852,) in date of commission the oldest whaling captain of the port.

The single voyage, that perhaps before any other merits special notice, is that of the *Clematis*, (Capt. Benjamin,) fitted out by Williams and Barnes, and arriving July 4th, 1841. She was out ten months and twenty-nine days; went round the world, and brought home 2,548 barrels oil. This voyage, when the time, the distance sailed, and the quantity of oil brought home are considered in connection, merits to be ranked among remarkable achievements.

There is no associated line of business in which the profits are more equitably divided among those engaged in it, than in the whale fishery. The owners, agents, officers and crew are all partners in the voyage, and each has his proportionate share of the results. Its operation, therefore, is to enlarge the means and multiply the comforts of the many, as well as to add to the wealth of the wealthy. The old West India trade, which preceded it, was destructive in a remarkable degree, to human life and health, and engendered habits of dissipation, turbulence, and reckless extravagance. The whaling business is a great advance upon this, not only as it regards life, but also in its relation to order, happiness and morality. The mass of the people, the *public*, have gained by the exchange. The improvements in the aspect of the city during the last twenty years, may be traced to the successful prosecution of the whale fishery.

In 1845, the whaling business reached its maximum: seven vessels were added that year to the fleet, which then consisted of seventy-one ships and barks, one brig, and five schooners. In January, 1846, the *McLellan*, of 336 tuns, was purchased by Perkins and Smith, with the design of making an experiment in the Greenland fishery. This made the seventy-eighth vessel sailing from New London in pursuit of whales; and ranked the place more than 1,000 tuns before Nantucket in the trade. New Bedford was still far ahead, but no other port in the world stood between.

The *McLellan* has made six voyages to Davis' Straits; but the seasons have been peculiarly unfavorable, and she has met with little success. She is now absent (1852) on her seventh voyage.

Employed in the whale fishery from New London:

1820, one ship, three brigs—950 tuns.

1846, seventy-one ships and barks, one brig, six schooners—26,200 tuns; capital embarked nearly two millions of dollars.

In 1847, the tide began to ebb; the trade had been extended beyond what it would bear, and was followed by a depression of the market and a scarcity of whale. The fleet was that year reduced to fifty-nine ships and barks, one brig and six schooners: total, sixty-six; tunnage, 22,625.

In 1850, about fifty vessels were employed, or 17,000 tuns, and the capital about \$1,200,000.

In 1849 and 1850, twenty-five whaling captains abandoned the business, and went to California.

Value of imports from the whale fishery, as exhibited by the custom-house returns: 1850—\$618,055. 1851—\$1,109,410.

A Table of Imports of Whale and Sperm Oil into the port of New London, from 1820 to 1851, inclusive.¹

Year.	Ships and Barks.	Brigs.	Schooners and Sloops.	Barrels of Whale Oil.	Barrels of Sperm Oil.
1820	1	2	0	1,731	78
1821	0	3	0	2,323	105
1822	1	4	0	4,528	194
1823	4	2	0	6,712	2,318
1824	3	2	0	4,996	1,924
1825	4	0	0	5,483	2,276
1826	2	0	0	2,804	88
1827	5	0	0	3,375	6,166
1828	3	0	0	5,435	168
1829	9	0	0	11,325	2,205
1830	14	0	0	15,248	9,792
1831	14	0	0	19,402	5,487
1832	12	0	0	21,375	703
1833	17	0	0	22,395	8,503
1834	9	1	2	12,030	4,565
1835	13	1	0	14,041	11,866
1836	12	1	0	18,663	3,198
1837	17	0	1	26,774	8,460
1838	15	0	3	25,523	3,426
1839	15	1	2	26,278	4,094
1840	17	2	1	32,038	4,110
1841	15	1	2	26,893	3,920
1842	16	1	3	28,165	4,055
1843	20	0	0	34,677	3,598
1844	18	1	3	39,816	2,296
1845	21	0	0	52,576	1,411
1846	13	1	2	27,441	1,306
1847	35	0	2	76,287	4,765
1848	20	1	1	54,115	3,606
1849	17	0	3	38,030	1,949
1850	17	0	0	36,545	1,603
1851	26	0	2	67,508	2,914

¹ This table, and most of the statistics of the whale fishery since 1820, are taken from the Whaling Record of Henry P. Haven, which exhibits the date, length, and results of every whaling voyage made from New London since that period.

Shortest voyage, ship Manchester Packet, 1832: seven months and nineteen days—(not including voyages of the McLellan to Davis' Straits.)

Longest voyage, ship William C. Nye, arrived Feb. 10th, 1851; out fifty-seven months and eleven days.

Largest quantity of oil in one voyage, ship Robert Bowne, 1848; 4,850 barrels.

Largest quantity of whale-oil in one voyage, ship Atlantic, 1848; 4,720 barrels.

Largest quantity of sperm-oil, in one voyage, ship Phœnix, 1833; 2,971 barrels.

Largest quantity of oil imported in any one ship, ship Neptune, 27,845 whale, 2,710 sperm.

In 1847, the number of vessels employed from New London, in freighting, coasting and home fisheries was 171, viz., nine ships and barks, three brigs, fifty-six schooners, 103 sloops and smacks; whole burden 12,300 tuns.¹ The number of seamen employed in the whale fishery and domestic trade was about 3,000.

The year 1849 was distinguished by the general rush for California; nineteen vessels sailed for that coast from New London, but of these one schooner was fitted in Norwich, and two or three others were in part made up from adjoining towns.

The statistics of the business with California for two years have been estimated as follows:²

Sent in 1849, four ships, three barks, twelve schooners; 3,745 tuns. Passengers, 152; seamen, 186.

Value of goods; merchandise, \$3,228.

“ “ domestic products, \$70,418.

“ “ domestic manufactures, \$45,520.

Sent in 1850, one ship, one brig, three schooners; 803 tuns.

Passengers, fifteen; seamen, fifty-three.

Value of merchandise, \$1,905.

“ domestic products, \$19,598.

“ domestic manufactures, \$10,524.

About fifty persons from New London went in steamers or vessels from other ports.³ The whole number that went from the place to

¹ From statistics furnished the Harbor and River Convention, at Chicago, in December, 1847, by T. W. Williams.

² New London Democrat.

³ Nine or ten vessels sailed for California from Mystic.

California in those two years, as seamen and passengers, could not have been less than 450.

The whole value of vessels and cargoes, was supposed to be about \$280,000.

Since 1850, the whaling business instead of continuing to retrograde, has revived, and is again on the advance. Several fine vessels have been added to the fleet during the present year, (1852,) and among them the *N. S. Perkins*, (309 tuns,) a clipper ship, built in the port, and designed to unite the essential requisites of capacity, safety and speed. The whole number of whaling vessels now sailing from New London is fifty-five, that is, forty-nine ships and barks, one brig, and five schooners. The whaling merchants, with the number and description of vessels fitted out by each, are as follows:

Ships and Barks. Brig. Schooners.			
Lyman Allyn,	1		
Benjamin Brown's Sons,	4	1	
J. Chester & F. Harris,	1		
Frink & Prentis,	3		
Thomas Fitch, 2d,	3		
James M. Green,	1		
Miner, Lawrence & Co.,	6		
Perkins & Smith,	8	2	
E. V. Stoddard,	2	3	
Weaver, Rogers & Co.,	2		
Williams & Barnes,	8		
Williams & Haven,	10		

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Death of General Huntington.—Custom-house built,—Subsequent collectors.—Commercial memoranda.—Light-houses.—Ledges.—Fort Trumbull.—Steam navigation in the Sound.—Account of the steam-ship *Savannah*.—Newspapers.—Fire Companies.—Turnpike Companies.—Groton Ferry.—Burial of the Walton family.—Remains of Commodore Rogers.—Banks.—Railroads and other associations.—Cedar Grove Cemetery.—Population.—List of Town-Clerks.—Members of Congress.—College graduates.

GENERAL JEDIDIAH HUNTINGTON, the first collector of the port under the federal government, resigned the office in 1815. He was an officer of the army of the Revolution, serving through the whole war, and after 1777, with the rank of Brigadier-general. At one period he was attached to the person and family of Washington as his aid, and was always regarded by the latter as a tried friend. When Gen. Huntington built his house in New London, he had it modeled, in some degree, after the plan of Mount Vernon, establishing a resemblance in the rooms, the portico, and the roof, in affectionate remembrance of that place.

The collector's office, during a portion of the term of Gen. Huntington, was more lucrative and involved a greater amount of business than at any other period since the foundation of the town. Before the difficulties commenced which led to the second war with Great Britain, we are told that at least eighty coasters were owned in the river, principally at Norwich and New London, and that one hundred and fifty sail of merchant vessels cleared and entered at the port of New London. The receipts of the office were from \$50,000, to \$200,000, annually, of which the collector received \$6,000 for his salary. The simplicity of Gen. Huntington's accommodations, compared with the amount of business and the value of the customs, is somewhat remarkable. He accomplished all the duties of his office in a single room over a store, at the corner of Bank Street and the

Parade, yet no one ever heard him utter a complaint respecting want of room, or inconvenience of situation. His immediate successors were not much better accommodated. But in 1833, the general government decided to build a custom-house. An eligible lot was procured in Bank Street, and an appropriate stone structure erected at a cost of nearly \$30,000. This includes the lot, which was \$3,400, and all subsequent appropriations. The plan was prepared by Robert Mills, engineer and architect, in the employ of the government. The material is granite, mostly from the quarry at Millstone Point, but the front is of finer grain, and was quarried a few miles west of the city. The *door* has a peculiar value on account of its historical associations. It was once a part of the old frigate Constitution. When that vessel was broken up in New York, the portions that remained sound were reserved for special purposes in public works, and a plank was obtained to be used for the door of this custom-house.

General Thomas H. Cushing, the second collector, received the appointment in 1815, and held it till his death, Oct. 19th, 1822. He was a native of Massachusetts, born in December, 1755, had served in the Revolutionary War, and in 1790 was in the army of St. Clair, holding at that time a captain's commission. In 1813, during the second war with Great Britain, he attained the rank of brigadier-general.

Captain Richard Law, a native of the town, was the third collector and held the office eight years.

4th. Ingoldsby W. Crawford, of Union, Ct., in office eight years.

5th. Charles F. Lester, of Norwich, in office four years.

6th. Wolcott Huntington, appointed in 1842, and held the office a year and a half, when C. F. Lester was reappointed, and continued in office till his decease, in March, 1846.

7th. Thomas Mussey, a native of Exeter, Maine, but a resident of New London since 1816—in office two years and a half.

8th. Nicoll Fosdick, a native of the town, appointed in September, 1849, and still in office.

The following is an abstract of the duties received at the custom-house, during the first ten years of the present century—Norwich, Stonington and Connecticut River included.

1801,	\$78,478.	1806,	\$214,940.
1802,	94,656.	1807,	201,888.
1803,	63,222.	1808,	98,107.
1804,	112,922.	1809,	58,417.
1805,	156,644.	1810,	22,343.

The district is now restricted to the river Thames, and the coast westward to Connecticut River. The whale ships pay but trifling duties, and from 1840 to 1845 inclusive, the amount of duties did not exceed \$300. In 1846, it was upward of \$800. In 1849, \$38,658. In 1850, \$8,815.

Foreign Commerce.

Vessels Entered.	Tuns.	Men.	Cleared.	Tuns.	Men.
In 1849, 31	9,091	646	29	7,917	648
In 1850, 23	7,171	553	80	8,058	635
In 1851, 28	9,610	806	27	9,134	525

Amount of Tunnage in the District of New London, 1850.

Registered, 23,149.69. Enrolled, 12,474.89.

Temporary, 1,045.27. Licensed, 992.92.

Total, 37,662.77

U. S. Steam Marine, District of New London, for 1850.

5,008 tuns, at 2,219 horse-power, employing 112 men. Transporting 73,083 passengers, at an average distance of 155 miles.¹

The masters of the light-boats keep lists of all vessels that are seen to pass their stations. A statement of the number that passed Bartlett's Reef, at different periods, will give some idea of the commerce of Long Island Sound.

1841. Ships, 162; brigs, 459; schooners, 4,906; sloops, 11,418; steamers, 1,168: total, 18,118.

1847. Ships, 230; brigs, 672; schooners, 9,979; sloops, 18,750; steamers, 2,087: total, 26,718.

1850. Ships, 142; brigs, 510; schooners, 9,124; sloops, 8,075; steamers, 3,116: total, 20,967.

The total number passing Eel-grass Shoal, in 1850, was 17,697.

The collector of the port of New London, until within a few years past, was superintendent of all the light-houses of the state, but at present those west of Connecticut River are under the charge of the New Haven collector.

Those belonging to New London district are:

1st. West side of the harbor's mouth or entrance of the river Thames. First built in 1760; rebuilt and assumed by the general government in 1800. The height of the tower is eighty feet.

¹ These statements are furnished by H. T. Deering, deputy collector, from the custom-house returns.

2d. Lynde Point, west side of the entrance to Connecticut River. First lighted August 17th, 1803; rebuilt 1889.

3d. Stonington Point; established in 1823; rebuilt 1840.

4th. Morgan's Point, near Mystic, in Groton, 1881.

5th. Fisher's Island Hommock; 1849. This light has red shades.

Floating Lights.—1st, light-boat on Bartlett's Reef; established in 1835; a new boat of 145 tuns, furnished in 1848.

2d. Light-boat on Eel-grass Shoal, in Fisher's Island Sound, to which the former boat on Bartlett's Reef was transferred in 1849.

Formerly the collector had a revenue cutter attached to his office, having the eastern part of the Sound to Montauk Point for its cruising ground, and keeping a watch upon Gardiner's Bay and Fisher's Island Sound. Capt. Elisha Hinman had command of this cutter for a number of years. The present Capt. Andrew Mather, of New London, was another of its commanders. It has been removed from the station within a few years past.

The most dangerous points in entering the harbor of New London, are Black Ledge and Race Point. Black Ledge has one foot of water at low tide on the shoalest part. Race Point is a long, low beach at the west end of Fisher's Island, surrounded with dangerous rocks, which extend into the water at some distance from the land. South-west from this point, with a ship channel between, is a single bold rock, upon which a spindle is erected, called Race Rock. This rock is a great impediment in the path of navigation, but the prediction may be uttered with confidence, that its removal will hereafter be accomplished. Standing alone, with deep water in its vicinity, it might be blasted away with less apparent difficulty than usually attends such operations.

On the north shore of Fisher's Island, east of Race Point, the steamer *Atlantic* was wrecked Nov. 27th, 1846. In this dreadful catastrophe, forty-two persons perished. The government has since purchased one of the Hommocks or islets of Fisher's Island, lying north-east of the rocks on which the *Atlantic* struck, and have erected upon it a light-house, furnished with a brilliant flame-colored light. Bartlett's Reef is three miles south-west of the harbor's mouth, in the track of vessels passing to and from New York. Here a light-boat is stationed.

Fort Trumbull is situated on a point of land that extends into the river from the west side, nearly a mile and a half north of the light-house, and two-thirds of a mile in a straight line from the center of the town. The present structure is the third that has stood upon the

spot. The old revolutionary fortress, built in 1775, was an irregular work, of comparatively small size; but standing high on its muniton of rock, it had a gallant air of defiance, that concealed in a measure its defects. The old inhabitants of the town regarded this fort with a kind of hallowed affection. It was allowed to fall into decay, but this very neglect softened its features, and gave it a rural and picturesque appearance, pleasing to the eye of taste. In 1812, the old walls and battlements were entirely leveled, and the work reconstructed from its foundation. The portions retained of the former work were so inconsiderable, that it was considered a new fort. In a military point of view, it was far superior to the former structure, yet by no means a finished work. The surface had been imperfectly prepared, and the disheveled rocks that ran straggling about the isthmus, were much better adapted to cover and protect assailants than to defend the garrison.

This second fortification was demolished in 1839, the rugged ledges blasted away, and the site beautifully graded for the reception of the new fortress. The old original block-house of 1775, has however been retained through all changes, standing amid the magnificent walls and embankments of modern art, like a sepulcher in which the old forts lie entombed.

The present fort is constructed of granite, from the quarry at Mill-stone Point, and was ten years in building. The works were planned and executed from the commencement to the completion in 1849, by Capt. George W. Cullum of the U. S. Engineers. By his judicious management, the cost of construction was kept within the first estimate, viz., \$250,000. It is allowed by all observers to be a beautiful structure; simple, massive, and yet elegant in form and finish, a magnificent outpost to the town, and a fine object in the landscape.

The first regular line of steamboats from New York to New London was established in 1816. On the 28th of September, in that year, the Connecticut (Bunker) arrived from New York in twenty-one hours, which was regarded as a signal triumph of steam, the wind and a swell of the tide being against her. In October, the regular line commenced, making two trips per week to New Haven. The Fulton (Capt. Law) was running at the same time between New York and New Haven. The price of passage was five dollars to New Haven, and from thence to New York, four dollars.

Steam propellers, carrying principally freight, but some passengers,

commenced navigating the Sound in 1844. The first was the Quinebaug.

In one respect New London stands in honorable connection with the history of steam navigation. Capt. Moses Rogers, the commander of the steam-ship Savannah, the first steam-vessel that ever crossed the Atlantic, and Capt. Stevens Rogers, sailing-master of the same, and brother-in-law of the captain, were both natives of New London. The Savannah was built in New York, under the direction of Capt. Rogers, for a company in Savannah, and was a full-rigged ship of about 350 tons burden, and furnished with an engine of eighty or ninety horse-power, by which she made about eight knots to the hour. She sailed from Savannah, May 26th, 1819, for the sole purpose of making the grand experiment of ocean steam-navigation. Mr. Scarborough, of Savannah, one of the company that owned the steamer, asserted that they had no other object in view; that anticipating the use of steam-engineery in that line, and having a surplusage of profit on hand from some successful operations of the company, instead of dividing it, they built and fitted out the Savannah, in order to give to America the honor of making the first attempt to navigate the Atlantic by steam.

The passage to Liverpool was made in twenty-two days; fourteen by steam and eight by sails, the latter being used solely through the prudence of the captain to save the consumption of fuel, lest some emergency might occur, and the supply be exhausted. From Liverpool the steamer proceeded to Copenhagen, and from thence to Stockholm and to St. Petersburg. At these ports she excited universal admiration and interest. Lying at anchor like a public vessel, with no business to accomplish, no port charges to defray, no cargo to take on board, her stay was a continued reception of visitors, and her whole passage through the Baltic might be likened to a triumphant procession. Bernadotte, king of Sweden, and the emperor of Russia, with their nobles and public officers, not only came on board to examine the wonderful American steamer, but tested her performance by short excursions in the neighboring waters. On the return home, the last place left in Europe was Arendel, in Norway, from whence the passage to Savannah was made in twenty-five days; nineteen by steam and six by sails.

Capt. Moses Rogers gained his experience as a steam engineer, on the Hudson River, where he had been engaged in some of the earliest experiments in propelling vessels by steam. After his return from the voyage in the Savannah, he took command of a steamboat

running on the Great Pee Dee River, and died suddenly at Cheraw, S. C., Sept. 15th, 1822, at the age of forty-two years.

Capt. Stevens Rogers is now an officer of the customs in New London, and from him the foregoing account of the first voyage by steam across the Atlantic, is derived.¹ He has in his possession a massive gold snuff-box, presented to him by Lord Lyndock, an English nobleman, who took passage in the steamer from Stockholm to St. Petersburg, through an arrangement made for him by Mr. Hughes, the American minister at the Swedish court. On the inside of the lid is the following inscription :

"Presented by Sir Thomas Graham, Lord Lyndock, to Stevens Rogers, sailing-master of the steam-ship Savannah, at St. Petersburg, October 10th, 1819."

Capt. Moses Rogers, among other costly presents, received from the emperor of Russia, an elegant silver tea-urn.

The log-book kept during this voyage, is deposited in the National Institute at Washington.

Newspapers.

There are two newspaper establishments in the town, regularly issuing a daily and weekly paper, under the control of a single editor and proprietor.

The New London Daily and Weekly Chronicle, by C. F. Daniels, formerly proprietor and editor of the Camden Journal, and afterward connected with the New York Courier and Enquirer, and the New York Gazette.

The Daily Star and the New London Democrat, by D. S. Rud-dock.

The first newspaper of the town bore the following title :

THE NEW LONDON SUMMARY,
OR THE
Weekly Advertiser,
With the Freshest Advices, Foreign and Domestic.

¹ A more detailed account of the Savannah and her voyage, was published in the New York Journal of Commerce, August 23d, 1850; the facts being obtained from the same source as the above, viz., Capt. Stevens Rogers, of New London.

At the close of the paper was the notification, *Printed by Timothy Green*. It was a folio sheet; the size of the page about twelve inches by eight, with two columns of print. The heading was adorned with an ornamented cut of the colony seal, with the escutcheon of the town added by way of crest, viz., a ship in full sail. The first number was issued August 8th, 1758. The editor died August 3d, 1763, and the paper was discontinued.

2. "The New London Gazette," with a stamp of the king's arms, appeared in November, 1763. The size was considerably increased, the print arranged in three columns, and the price 6s. *per annum*; one-half to be paid on the delivery of the first number. This was in fact the same paper under another name, being a continuation by Timothy Green, nephew and assistant of the former publisher; but as the numerical series of the *Summary* was not continued, the numbers being commenced anew, it may be classed as another paper. It was soon enlarged in size, and the name changed in the course of a few years to "The Connecticut Gazette." This had been the title of the first newspaper in the colony, established in New Haven, 1755, by James Parker and Co.; John Holt, editor; but discontinued in 1767, and there being then no paper in the colony bearing that title, it was adopted by the proprietor of the New London paper. In 1789, Mr. Green took his son Samuel into partnership with him, and the *Gazette* was issued by Timothy Green and Son, to 1794, when Samuel Green assumed the whole business. In 1805, he retired a while from the paper, and it was issued by "Cady and Eells," (Ebenezer P. Cady, and Nathaniel Eells.) In May, 1808, it was resumed by Green, and continued to January, 1838, when it passed for two years into the hands of John J. Hyde, who was both editor and publisher. In 1840, it reverted to the former proprietor, or to his son, S. H. Green, and was conducted by the latter to July, 1841. The next editor was A. G. Seaman, by whom it was continued about three years, after which the existence of the *Gazette* entirely ceased. It had been issued regularly under the name of the *Gazette*, for more than eighty years.

We would here notice that the *Spooner* family, which is connected with the history of newspapers in this country, was linked both by marriage and occupation, with the Greens. Judah P. Spooner and Alden Spooner, early printers in Vermont, were sons of Thomas Spooner (who came to New London from Newport in 1753) and brothers-in-law of Timothy Green. Alden Spooner, 2d, son of the first named of the brothers, was a native of New London. He is

known as the editor of "The Suffolk Gazette," published at Sag Harbor from 1804 to 1811, and of the "Long Island Star," which he conducted from 1811 to his death, a period of about thirty-five years.

Charles Miner, long a noted printer in Wilkesbarre, Penn., obtained his knowledge of the business in the Gazette office at New London. He was for a number of years a member of Congress, and has left an enduring memorial of his talents and research, in the History of Wyoming, of which he is the author.

Green's Connecticut Register, was first published in 1785, and again in 1786; it was then intermittent for one year, but has regularly appeared every year since, making, inclusive of 1852, seventy-six volumes.¹

After the year 1750, the Greens annually printed an Almanac or Astronomical Diary. The first numbers were prepared by James Davis, and calculated for the meridian of New London. Next to the series of Davis, they reprinted the Boston Almanac of Nathaniel Ames, until 1766, when Clark Elliott, a mathematician and instrument maker, who had settled in New London, commenced an independent series of almanacs, which were at first published with his own name, but afterward with the assumed one of Edmund Freebetter. This change is said to have been caused by a mistake which Elliot made in one of his astronomical calculations, which so much disconcerted him that he refused ever after to affix his name to the almanac. He died in 1793, and Nathan Daboll, of Groton, began his series of almanacs with that year, which were continued by him during his life, and have been prepared by successors of the same name and family, to the present year, 1852.

Nathan Daboll was a self-taught mathematician. He compiled an arithmetic, which was extensively used in the schools of New England, and a system of practical navigation, that was also highly esteemed. He opened a school in New London for the common and higher branches of mathematics, and the principles of navigation. He died in Groton, March 9th, 1818, aged sixty-eight.

3. "The Weekly Oracle; printed and published by James Springer, opposite the Market." This was the title of a newspaper commenced at New London in October, 1796, and continued four years.

1 Col. Samuel Green, for so many years editor and proprietor of the Gazette, though no longer a resident in New London, is still living, (1852,) aged eighty-four, realizing that happy enjoyment of health, cheerfulness and prosperity, which is designated as a *green old age*.

4. "The Bee; printed and published by Charles Holt." This paper was commenced June 14th, 1797, and discontinued June 30th, 1802. The editor immediately issued proposals for publishing a paper with the same title at Hudson, N. Y. The Bee may therefore be considered as transferred to that place. This paper was a prominent organ of the democratic party, and under the administration of the elder Adams, the editor was arrested for a libel, tried by the United States court then sitting at New Haven, and under the provisions of the sedition law condemned to six months' imprisonment, and to pay a fine of \$200. Charles Holt was a native of New London; he died in Jersey City, opposite New York, in August, 1852, aged seventy-eight.

5. "The Republican Advocate." Established in February, 1818, and continued about ten years. It was first issued by Clapp and Francis—Joshua B. Clapp and Simeon Francis—but after four or five years the partnership was dissolved. Francis removed to the west, and has for a number of years published a newspaper in Springfield, Illinois. Clapp continued the Advocate alone, until about the close of the year 1828, when he sold the establishment to John Eldridge. The latter changed the name to "The Connecticut Sentinel," but the publication was not long continued.

6. "The People's Advocate, and New London County Republican." This paper was commenced August 26th, 1840, with the immediate object in view of promoting the election of William Henry Harrison to the presidency. The proprietor was Benjamin P. Bissell. The editor for 1840, John Jay Hyde; for 1841, Thomas P. Trott. Bissell then took the whole charge of the paper till his death, Sept. 3d, 1842. In 1843, J. G. Dolbeare and W. D. Manning appeared as associated editors and proprietors, but the next year, Dolbeare assumed the sole editorship. In November, 1844, he commenced the first daily paper published in New London; it was a folio sheet, the page twelve inches by nine, and called "The Morning News." In April, 1848, the Advocate and the News were merged in the Weekly and Daily Chronicle, which commencing a new series of numbers, and bearing a different name, must be considered as altogether a new undertaking.

7. "The New London Democrat" was commenced March 22d, 1845, by J. M. Scofield and S. D. Macdonald; but the second editor retired with the publication of the forty-fourth number. January 1st, 1848, Scofield, in connection with the Democrat, commenced a daily paper entitled "The Morning Star." He has since emigrated to

California, having assigned his whole printing establishment, January 1st, 1849, to D. S. Ruddock, the present editor and proprietor of the Star and Democrat.

8. The New London Weekly and Daily Chronicle, were first issued in May, 1848, by C. F. Daniels and F. H. Bacon, an association which continued for three years. Since August, 1851, C. F. Daniels has been sole editor and proprietor.

The above are all the serial publications of the town that have been continued long enough to count their existence by years. Transient undertakings for a special purpose, and some occasional papers not issued at regular intervals, have been omitted.

Fire-Companies.

In the year 1805, the city was empowered by the Legislature to establish fire-companies, consisting of eighteen men each; a privilege that had been previously granted to Hartford, Middletown and Norwich. The fire-department was thus transferred from the town to the city authority. Three companies were soon afterward acknowledged, and to these a fourth was subsequently added. Two of the engines were new in 1848. In 1850, the Independent Nameaug Fire Company was formed, which purchased by subscription a superb engine, at the cost of \$1,200. This fifth company is a voluntary undertaking, but like the others, under the control of the city fire-department. Their discipline, neat equipments, and beautiful engine, rank them as the most brilliant fire-company in the state.

Turnpike Companies.

Three turnpike companies have been established at different periods, having one of the termini of each at New London. The commissioners of the road leading from New London to Norwich, through the Mohegan reservation, were authorized to establish a gate and collect a toll, by a resolve of the General Assembly, in May, 1792. This was the first turnpike of the state, or perhaps coeval with a toll-gate established on the stage road in the town of Greenwich, Fairfield County. The commissioners on the Mohegan road were William Stewart and Samuel Wheat, of New London, Joseph Howland and Ebenezer Huntington, of Norwich. The railroad constructed in 1849, along the bank of the river, in the same direction with this turnpike, now absorbs nearly the whole travel. The com-

pany, by consent of the legislature, have relinquished their charter, and during the present year, 1852, ceased to exist. The establishment of a railway is generally a death-blow to the nearest turnpike.

The Hartford and New London Turnpike Company was incorporated in 1800. This company assumed the old highway of the town, leading west from State to Hempstead Street, and from the point where this ended, (on the north side of the Edgecombe house,) they opened an entirely new road to Colchester, further to the south, and less hilly and circuitous than the old country road that went out of the city by the present Granite and Vauxhall Streets. In 1829 that part of the road lying east of Huntington Street, was discontinued by the company, assumed by the city, and in 1845, the city accepted another portion, lying west of Huntington Street, which has since been graded, furnished with sidewalks and called Broad Street. The turnpike road now commences at Williams Street.

The New London and Lyme Turnpike Company was incorporated in May, 1807, for the purpose of establishing a new and improved route from New London through Lyme to Connecticut River. This company commenced their road at the end of Bank Street, constructed a bridge over Bream Cove, (the town assisting them with a bonus of \$500, and the materials of the old bridge,) and opened a highway over the neck to join the main road, forming a new entrance into the town. This new street was named by the city authorities in 1815, Shaw's Avenue.¹

The ferry to Groton has been one of the standing embarrassments of the town. The disposition of it from the earliest times has been by leases, varying in term from one year to fifty years, and in rent from two or three pounds to two hundred dollars *per annum*. The ancient ferry wharf was near the head of Water Street, a position of manifest advantage when a sail-boat was used, as the high ground of Winthrop's Neck served as a protection from the winds and swell of the waves. It was comparatively easy, even in rugged weather, to round the point and run into the smooth water of the cove. The width of the river from this old wharf to the ferry wharf in Groton,

¹ Among the improvements of modern times, a more refined taste in names is worthy of note. Shaw's Avenue was at first "the highway over Hog Neck." It would have been a disgrace to the town to retain such a name.

as measured on the ice with a chain in February, 1741, was one hundred and fifty-four rods.

In 1794, the sum of \$500 was raised by subscription, and a wharf built at the end of the Parade, which was accepted by the town as the *only* ferry wharf. The width of the river from this point to the opposite shore, as measured on the ice in January, 1821, was one hundred and forty-four rods, sixteen rods short of half a mile. The wharf was rebuilt in 1815. In 1821, a horse or team ferry-boat commenced running. This was an improvement on sculling, rowing and sails; but it was often out of repair, and in some respects inconvenient and offensive. In 1849, an arrangement was made by the town with Maro M. Comstock, by which he was to have a lease of the ferry for ten years, (to Feb. 1st, 1849,) on condition of his running a ferry-boat propelled by steam. Under this lease a steamboat was provided, seventy feet long, thirty-five feet wide, and of twenty-five horse-power, which furnishes the public with every requisite accommodation.

The river is seldom frozen opposite the town, or much below the point of Winthrop's Neck. Such an event occurs however once in twelve, fifteen, or twenty years. In 1821, the harbor was closed for six days, commencing January 24th, and the ice extended below the town, nearly to the mouth of the river. In 1836, the frost was yet more intense and protracted. January 30th, the river was crossed on skates, but the same day the Bunker Hill steamer came up to the wharf, breaking through the ice, and landed her passengers. February 2d, the ship Newark, on her way to New York, came into the river in distress, and was brought up to the wharf, by cutting through ice six inches in thickness. On the 6th, a rare spectacle was presented; the weather being fair, and the ice firm, a large number of people went out upon the river. Parties of both sexes and all ages, might be seen scattered over the harbor, some walking, and others on skates, while sleighs and teams were crossing back and forth from Groton. The ice was perfectly secure, a foot thick opposite the town, and about six inches at the light-house. A thaw commenced with a storm the next day.

In January, 1852, there was again a bridge of ice across the river which continued firm from the 21st to the 24th, inclusive. The steam ferry-boat kept a path open for crossing, but people crossed on foot by its side. A measurement was made of the width of the river from Coit's wharf to the Groton shore, and found to be about two-fifths of a mile.

In 1835, a lot for a new or third burial-ground, was purchased by the city for \$1,200. One-third part was reserved for free interments, and the remainder laid out in family lots.

Two of the most imposing funerals ever witnessed in the city, are connected with interments in this ground, viz., the burial of the Walton family, and the re-interment of the remains of Commodore George W. Rodgers. These solemnities demand a more particular description.

Among the passengers of the *Atlantic* wrecked on the coast of Fisher's Island, was an English emigrant family of the name of Walton. They had sojourned a short time in West Newbury, Mass., and were then on their way to the far west. The father, mother, and four children perished. A young man, recently married to one of the daughters, and a boy, thirteen years of age, were all that survived of a family of eight persons. They had no home in this country—no departed relatives to whom they might be gathered—no friends to claim their remains, and bestow on them the last rites. This family was brought to New London, and the whole city spontaneously pressed forward with offers of aid and sympathy to the bereaved, and of an honorable sepulture for the dead.

A granite pillar, twenty feet in height from the surface, was raised over the graves of the family in the third burial-ground, with the following inscription :

“Erected by citizens of New London, as a memorial of the loss of the steamer *Atlantic*, wrecked on Fisher's Island, Nov. 27th, A. D., 1849.

“Near this spot are buried John Walton, aged 51. Jane A., his wife, aged 45, and their children, Mary-Ann, aged 18, (wife of Robert Vine,) John, aged 13, Eleanor-Jane, aged 11, and James, aged 6, natives of England, who with more than thirty others, perished in the wreck.”¹

Commodore Rodgers died in 1832, while in command of the U. S. naval force on the coast of Brazil, and was interred at Buenos Ayres. He had resided for some years in New London, and his family have since continued here. One of his sons, Lieut. Alexander P. Rodgers, was killed at the battle of Chepultepec, in Mexico, September 13th, 1837, and his remains brought to New London for interment. Subsequently the navy department made arrangements to have the remains of the commodore removed to this country. They were con-

¹ Robert Vine and Jacob Walton, the survivors of this family, returned to their former residence in West Newbury.

veyed to New York in the U. S. ship Lexington, and brought from thence under a naval escort in charge of Commodore Kearney and other officers, and deposited by those of his son, June 6th, 1850. A great concourse of people, from this and the neighboring towns, assembled on the occasion. A band of music, belonging to the U. S. service was in attendance. Gov. Seymour, from Hartford, and his guards, were also present. The large number of persons that assembled on this occasion, and the blending of military pomp with religious services and solemn martial music, rendered it an impressive scene.

The *Union Bank* of New London was incorporated in May, 1792. This and the Hartford Bank, chartered at the same session, are the oldest banking institutions in Connecticut. The New Haven Bank was chartered in October of the same year. The capital of the Union Bank is \$100,000. Jedidiah Huntington was the first president; John Hallam, cashier.

New London Bank, incorporated in May, 1807. Capital, \$150,000. Elias Perkins, first president. Anthony Thatcher, cashier.

Savings Bank; May, 1827. The benefit of the seafaring population was the first and principal object that led to the formation of this institution. The members of the corporation enumerated in the act were the following:

William P. Cleaveland,	Nathaniel Saltonstall,
Ebenezer Learned,	Peter Richards,
Robert Coit,	Ezra Chappell,
Edward Learned,	Increase Wilson,
Isaac Thompson,	William P. Cleaveland, Jr.
Ephraim Chesebrough,	Thomas West.
Archibald Mercer,	Charles S. Stockman,
Jirah Isham,	Guy Turner,
Nathaniel S. Perkins,	Thomas W. Williams,
Jacob B. Gurley.	

The first president was Ezra Chappell.

Whaling Bank, May, 1833. Capital, \$163,000. Coddington Billings, first president; Peter C. Turner, cashier.

Bank of Commerce. This company is recently organized, (Sept., 1852,) under the free banking law, which was established by the legislature at their May session. Capital, \$100,000. Acors Barns, president; Charles Butler, cashier.

Several insurance companies have been incorporated during the last half-century, but some have made no use of their charters, and others have closed their accounts and ceased to exist. The oldest was the *Union Insurance*, chartered in 1805. The *Marine and Fire* was in operation from 1831 to 1842. The *New London Marine* was organized in July, 1847, but discontinued business in 1849.

The New London Aqueduct Company obtained a charter in May, 1800. Capital, \$4,000; increased in 1802 to \$20,000. The earliest proprietors were George Hallam, Benjamin Butler, Robert Allyn, David Frink and Isaac Treby. This company entered with zeal into the project of supplying the whole city with water, and threaded all the principal streets with subterranean logs and pipes. The spring which afforded the supply of water is situated a little north of the town limits, on the west side of the road to Norwich. The undertaking was not sufficiently patronized to render it remunerative and after the trial of about a quarter of a century, it was abandoned.

The Lewis Female Cent Society was incorporated in May, 1819, upon the petition of Mary Perkins, Sarah Brainard, Elizabeth Denison and their associates, for the purpose of affording relief to indigent persons in New London and its vicinity. This society had already been a number of years in operation, having been formed in 1810, but at the period of organization, had received a bequest of \$500, made by Mrs. Harriet Lewis. The same amount has since been bequeathed to the society by Miss Matilda Wright. It is still in operation, a judicious and efficient society.

The Young Men's Library Association was organized in December, 1840. Dr. Isaac G. Porter was the first president. This association was presented with a complete Encyclopedia, and an entire set of Niles' Register. The library soon amounted to several thousand volumes, and was lodged in a new brick building on Bank Street, owned by Joseph Lawrence. This building, in January, 1848, was entirely consumed by fire, and the library of the young men was involved in its destruction. The books were all burnt, but the society had an insurance upon them of \$1,000, and having since resumed its operations, is gradually collecting a new library.

The old jail and the land belonging to it, which stood by the water-side on the Parade, were sold May 1st, 1845, for \$4,900. The same year, a city and county prison was built, of stone, between Hempstead and Franklin Streets, with a keeper's house attached, at a cost of \$7,500.

Railroads.

In May, 1847, the legislature incorporated the New London, Willimantic and Springfield Railroad Company. The charter was subsequently altered, to enable the company to construct the road from Willimantic to Palmer, instead of Springfield. Thomas W. Williams was chosen president of this corporation, and continued in office till the completion of the road. The first ground was broken in July, 1848, a little north of Norwich: the first trip to Willimantic in the cars, was made Nov. 15th, 1849. The road was opened to Stafford Springs in March, 1850, and to Palmer in September of that year.

The New Haven and New London Railroad Company was incorporated in 1849. Frederick R. Griffin, of Guilford, president. The work on the road commenced in March, 1851, and the route was opened through the whole distance, July 22d, 1852. This road passes through a number of fine country towns, and pleasant villages, and has Long Island Sound in sight during a great part of the route. A connection has been formed through the city with the railroad running north to Palmer, which completes the line from New York to Boston.

A telegraphic company was formed in November, 1847, by an association of citizens in New London and Norwich. It went immediately into operation.

A Cemetery Association was formed by a number of the citizens in 1850, Francis Allyn, president; having for its object the purchase of a rural cemetery, at such convenient distance from the prospective growth of the city, as might furnish security that the remains of the dead would never be disturbed. This association purchased a tract of forty-five acres of land, about a mile west of the city, mostly covered with cedars, but with considerable variety of surface, and capable of being improved into ornamental grounds. It was laid out with

artistic skill and taste by Dr. Horatio Stone; appropriately named the Cedar Grove Cemetery, and consecrated to its sacred use, Oct. 8th, 1851. Some removals from other places of sepulture were made immediately afterward; but the first remains not previously interred, which were deposited in this ground, were those of an esteemed citizen, Joseph C. Sistare, who was here laid to rest, Nov. 23d, 1851.

This beautiful resting-place for the dead has already become a hallowed retreat. The high ground, affording a noble prospect of the harbor and surrounding country, the gradual slope of the surface toward the east, the lakelet and the solemn grove beneath, are features of great natural beauty. It is easy of access, yet seated in deep seclusion, and the ideas of security and permanence attached to it—that here while time endures, the graves and monuments of the dead will be secured from removal—are pledges that this cemetery will take a strong hold upon the affections of the inhabitants, and henceforth become their chosen place of sepulture.

"I would not bury the good, the beloved, upon the bleak and desolate sand-plain, where no tree can cast its shade, and no flower blossom: I would rather lay them beneath the boughs of the goodly cedar-trees, which of old were dedicated to a sacred use in building a temple to the Lord, and which speak a prayer for perpetual remembrance in their foliage of unsading green. I would rather lay them here, where the winged songsters make their nests in these over-hanging boughs, and chant a requiem to the dead buried beneath."¹

The whole number of freemen qualified to vote at the election in April, 1848, was 1,527; the number of votes given, 957.

In 1852, the whole number on the list was about 2,000, and the number of votes deposited, 1,050. The list includes all absent freemen, whether on the ocean, in California, or elsewhere, and about 240 new voters, who were qualified previous to the election.

The present number of inhabitants is estimated at 10,000.

Population at different periods.

In 1756, 3,171. Montville and Waterford then included.

In 1774, 5,366 whites, 316 negroes, 206 Indians.

In 1800, 4,955 whites, 195 colored. Males, 2,378; females, 2,577. Waterford was not then separated.

¹ From the Address at the Consecration of Cedar Grove Cemetery, by Hiram Willey, Esq.

In 1810, 3,022 whites; free colored, 147; slaves, 13; total, 3,182. Another enumeration of the same year, made the total number 3,288, probably including the garrison of Fort Trumbull.

In Waterford, the same year, 2,191. In Montville, 2,187.

In 1820, 3,330. Males, 1,419; females, 1,652; free colored, 168; slaves, 6; garrison of Fort Trumbull, 82.

In Waterford, 2,236. In Montville, 1,952.

The increase from 1810 to 1820, was very small; it may be accounted for from the depression of business caused by war, the loss of many persons at sea, and in the West Indies, and emigration to other states.

In 1830, 4,356.

In 1840. The census returns made June 1st, furnished the following statistics in regard to New London:

Population, 5,519.

Engaged in agriculture, 229.

Engaged in commerce, 44.

Engaged in manufactures and trade, 784.

Engaged in navigation of ocean, 848.

Learned professions and engineers, 48.

Pensioners for military service, 15.

Deaf and dumb, 1. Blind, 2. Insane and idiots, 3.

Scholars in academies and grammar-schools, 131.

Scholars in private and common schools, 787.

No persons over twenty, who could not read and write.

A city census was taken in November, 1845, which showed a population of 8,850.

In 1850, 1,000 houses, 1,525 families, 9,006 inhabitants.

The average annual proportion of deaths since 1800, has been about one in fifty.

Town-Clerks.¹

1650, Jonathan Brewster.	1670, Charles Hill.
1651, Obadiah Bruen.	1684, Edward Palms.
1667, William Douglas.	1685, Daniel Wetherell.
1668, Daniel Wetherell.	1701, Richard Christophers,

¹ In this list, the clerk is understood to serve from the date against his name to the next. It is probable that the choice was always annual, but in many instances of an early date, it is not recorded, and the clerk is only ascertained by the handwriting.

1707, Daniel Wetherell.	1777, Edward Hallam.
1719, George Denison.	1781, John Owen.
1720, None. ¹	1801, Samuel Belden.
1721, Edward Hallam.	1811, David Coit.
1736, Daniel Coit.	1817, Ebenezer Way.
1757, John Coit.	1827, Henry Douglas.
1758, Daniel Coit.	1845, Ephraim H. Douglas.
1773, Jas. Mumford, (3 weeks.) ²	1850, Henry Douglas, (in office,
1773, Gurdon Saltonstall.	1852.

Members of Congress, from New London.

William Hillhouse,	from	1783	to	1786.
Richard Law,	from	1777	to	1778.
Richard Law,	from	1781	to	1784.
Amasa Learned,	from	1791	to	1795.
Joshua Coit,	from	1793	to	1798.
Elias Perkins,	from	1801	to	1803.
Lyman Law,	from	1811	to	1817.
Thomas W. Williams,	from	1839	to	1843.

Socii of Yale College, from New London.

Rev. Eliphalet Adams, from 1720 to 1738. A native of Dedham, Mass., but minister of New London from 1709 to 1753. He died among his people, and still has descendants here.

Hon. Elias Perkins, from 1818 to 1823. He was born in Lisbon, Conn., April 5th, 1767; but was from early life a resident in New London, where he died, Sept. 27th, 1845.

Rev. Abel McEwen, S. T. D., from 1826, and still in office, (1852.)

Hon. Noyes Billings; graduated at Yale in 1819; Lieut.-Governor of Connecticut in 1846, and by virtue of his office, fellow of the college. He is a native of Stonington, Conn., but has been from early life a resident of New London.

¹ Edward Hallam was chosen Feb. 1st, 1719-20, but the authorities refused to tender the oath to him, on account of his not being a freeman. April 11th, 1720, another town meeting was held, and Edward Hallam was again chosen clerk, the inhabitants refusing to vote for any other; but again the magistrates objected to his taking the oath. Dec. 26th, he was chosen the third time, and took the oath of office.

² Daniel Coit died February 2d, 1778. James Mumford was chosen to supply his place, but died three weeks after taking the oath of office.

Alumni of Yale College, natives of New London.

Joseph Coit, of Harvard,	1697.	Joshua Huntington,	
Yale,	1702.	(et Harv.)	1804.
John Picket,	1705.	Francis Bayard Winthrop,	1804.
Gurdon Saltonstall,	1725.	John Still Winthrop,	1804.
William Adams, (Tutor,)	1730.	Henry William Channing,	1807.
John Picket,	1732.	Daniel Huntington,	1807.
John Still Winthrop,	1737.	John Still W. Parkin,	1809.
Christopher Christophers,	1737.	William Henry Winthrop,	1809.
Thomas Adams,	1737.	Dyer T. Brainard, (M. D.,) ²	1810.
Nicholas Hallam,	1737.	Nathaniel Shaw Perkins,	
Thomas Fosdick,	1746.	(M. D.,) ²	1812.
James Abraham Hillhouse,		Thomas Shaw Perkins,	1812.
(Tutor,) ¹	1749.	Richard Pet'r Christophers,	1814.
Roswell Saltonstall,	1751.	John Law,	1814.
Russell Hubbard,	1751.	Frederick Richards,	1814.
Gurdon Saltonstall,	1752.	John Gardiner Brainard,	1814.
Winthrop Saltonstall,	1756.	William Pitt Cleaveland,	1816.
Amos Hallam,	1756.	John Caulkins Coit,	1818.
John Richards,	1757.	Joseph Hurlbut,	1818.
George Buttolph Hurlbut,	1757.	David Gardiner Coit,	1819.
<i>David</i> Daniel Manwaring,	1759.	Francis Bureau Deshon,	1820.
James Hillhouse, LL. D.,	1773.	Thomas Winthrop Coit,	
William Hillhouse,	1777.	S. T. D.,	1821.
John Caulkins,	1788.	William Henry Law,	1822.
Thomas Mumford,	1790.	Charles Griswold Gurley,	1827.
Lyman Law,	1791.	Robert Alexander Hallam,	1827.
Dudley Saltonstall,	1791.	Robert McEwen, (Tutor,)	1827.
Winthrop Saltonstall, (M.		Gurdon Saltonstall Coit,	1827.
D., Columbia,)	1793.	John Dickinson,	1827.
Prentice Law,	1800.	Charles Augustus Lewis,	1829.
William Law,	1801.	George Richards Lewis,	1829.
William Fowler Brainard,	1802.	Ebenezer Learned,	1831.

¹ James A. Hillhouse, was a native of the North Parish of New London, now Montville. He settled in New Haven. James and William Hillhouse, graduates of 1773 and 1777, were nephews of the former, and sons of Judge William Hillhouse, of the North Parish. They also settled in New Haven, and belong only in their birth to New London.

² Drs. Brainard and Perkins are now the oldest resident physicians in New London, having been in practice more than thirty years.

John Crump,	1833.	George Richards, (Tutor,) 1840.
John Calvin Goddard,	1833.	William Law Learned, 1840.
Billings Peck Learned,	1834.	Nathaniel Shaw Perkins, 1842.
William Cleaveland Crump,	1836.	John Jacob Brandegee, 1843.
Robert Coit Learned,	1837.	George Willard Goddard, 1845.
John Perkins C. Mather,	1837.	Augustus Brandegee, 1849.
William Perkins Williams,	1837.	Joseph Hurlbut, (Tutor,) 1849.
Hamilton Lanphere Smith,	1839.	Robert Coit, 1850.
Giles Henry Deshon,		1840.

Natives of New London, who have graduated at other Colleges.

Simon Bradstreet, son of Rev. Simon Bradstreet, born in New London, 1671, graduated at Harvard, 1693.

Joseph Coit, Harvard, 1697; Yale, 1702; first minister of Plainfield, Conn.

Christopher Christophers, Harvard, 1702.

Andrew Palmes, Harvard, 1703.

Rosewell Saltonstall, Harvard, 1720.

Joshua Coit, Harvard, 1776. M. C.

William Green, Dartmouth, 1791; Yale the same year. Received Episcopal ordination; was the first preceptor of the female academy in Green Street, 1800; died Dec. 26th, 1801, aged thirty.

Edward E. Law, Harvard, 1819.

Sabin K. Smith, Harvard, 1842.

Charles Sistare, Trinity College, Hartford, 1848.

It would be scarcely possible at the present day, to prepare a catalogue that would be complete and accurate, of the members of various collegiate institutions, that have made New London their home, but were not natives of the town. The following list comprises all that have come to the knowledge of the author, who became inhabitants and died in the place.

Simon Bradstreet; Harvard, 1660; ordained at New London, 1670; died, 1688; family removed.

Gurdon Saltonstall; Harvard, 1684; ordained at New London, 1691; chosen governor of Connecticut in 1708; died, 1724.

Eliphalet Adams; Harvard, 1694; ordained, 1709; married Lydia, daughter of Alexander Pygan, of New London.

Jeremiah Miller; Yale, 1709; settled in New London, 1711;

married Mary Saltonstall, second daughter of the governor; died, 1761.

Daniel Hubbard; Yale, 1727; tutor in college two years; settled as an attorney in New London, 1731; married Martha, daughter of John Coit; died in 1741, aged thirty-five.

David Gardiner; Yale, 1736; native of Gardiner's Island, in the Sound; merchant in New London for many years; died, 1776.

The above were probably all interred in the old burial-ground. This is known to be the case in all the instances except the first; and there can be no reasonable doubt but that Mr. Bradstreet's remains were also deposited in that inclosure, but there is no record that speaks of it, and no inscribed stone to mark the spot.¹

Samuel Seabury; Yale, 1748; D. D. at Oxford; Bishop of Connecticut and Rhode Island; died, 1796.

Richard Law; Yale, 1751. M. C. and Judge of Connecticut District. Born in Milford, and youngest son of Jonathan Law, governor of Connecticut. He married Ann Prentis, of New London; died January 26th, 1806.

Stephen Babcock; Yale, 1761; attorney in New London; died, 1787.

Ephraim Woodbridge; Yale, 1765; ordained over the Congregational church in New London, 1769; died, 1776.

Jedidiah Huntington; Harvard, 1763; et Yale, 1770. Born in Norwich, Aug. 15th, 1743; died in New London, Sept. 25th, 1818.

Amasa Learned; Yale, 1772. Born in Killingly, Conn., Nov. 15th, 1750. He came to New London soon after leaving college, and was one of the earliest preceptors of the Union School. In 1773, he married Grace Hallam, and in 1780, fixed his permanent residence in New London, where he died May 4th, 1825. His remains were deposited in the Hallam tomb, in the old burial-ground.

1 There are two large, flat granite stones, partly imbedded in the earth, near the center of the ground, which are supposed to have been laid as temporary memorials over the remains of some distinguished persons. The author is of opinion that one of these indicates the grave of Mr. Bradstreet, and the other of John Still Winthrop. The former died in 1683, at a time when engraved stones were procured with difficulty; and the latter in 1776, just at the opening of the war, which made New London the seat of desolation. In both cases, it was undoubtedly the intention of surviving friends, to replace the rough granite, with more fitting monuments, as soon as it should become practicable. But years elapsed, and it was not done: until it has become subject of question, where these persons were buried. It is, however, rendered tolerably certain, from the traces of letters yet remaining, that had been picked in the granite, that one of the stones covers the grave of a Winthrop.

David Wright; Yale, 1777; a native of Saybrook, Conn.; attorney of New London; died in 1798, of the malignant fever, which then prevailed. His wife was Martha, daughter of Russell Hubbard, of New London.

Jeremiah Gates Brainard; Yale, 1779; a native of East Haddam, Conn.; came to New London soon after leaving college, and engaged in the practice of the law. He had an office in the old court-house, on the Parade, at the time it was burnt by the British in 1781. He was for many years judge of the superior court; died Jan. 7th, 1830, in the seventieth year of his age. His wife was Sarah Gardiner, of New London.

Elias Perkins; Yale, 1786; married, in 1790, Lucretia Shaw, only daughter of Rev. Ephraim Woodbridge, deceased. His twin-brother, Elijah, (Yale, 1787,) died at Philadelphia in 1806.

William Pitt Cleveland; Yale, 1793; a native of Canterbury, Conn.; settled in New London as an attorney, before 1800; died, Jan. 3d, 1844, aged seventy-four. Hon. Roger M. Sherman, his fellow-student at the law-school of Judge Reeve, in Litchfield, and through life his intimate friend, died four days before him at Fairfield.

Jirah Isham; Yale, 1797; a native of Colchester, Conn., but long in the practice of the law at New London; he died Oct. 6th, 1842, aged sixty-four.

Elisha North, M. D., a native of Goshen, Litchfield Co., Conn. He studied with Dr. Lemuel Hopkins, of Hartford, and afterward, under Dr. Rush, at the medical college in Philadelphia. Settled in New London in 1812; died, Dec. 29th, 1843.

Archibald Mercer; born in Newark, N. J., Dec. 1st, 1788; graduated at Princeton, about 1807; M. D. at Philadelphia, and at New Haven, 1827; died, Oct. 3d, 1850.

These all died in New London, and most of them left their families here. We may add to the list a few living residents, who, though not natives of the town, belong to it in all but birth. Thirty years are reckoned a generation, and wherever thirty years of active life have been spent, there we may confidently say, the person belongs.

Jacob B. Gurley; graduated at Dartmouth, in 1793, and was introduced at New London the next year, as preceptor of the Union School; was admitted to the bar in 1797, and is now one of the oldest attorneys in the county.

Ebenezer Learned; Yale, 1798. Born in Killingly, Conn., March 27th, 1780, but from early infancy a resident in New London.

Abel McEwen ; Yale, 1804 ; a native of Winchester, Conn.; ordained over the Congregational church in this place, Oct. 21st, 1806, and now in the forty-sixth year of his ministry.

This list might be considerably enlarged, by introducing other and younger names from the professional ranks. It would be a pleasure to the writer to gather up many honored names from all the departments of active life ; but the pen of history has extended its details far enough into the bosom of the present. Let the names of the gifted and the mature, as well as of the young and the ardent of the present generation, be left for the future to record. They are stamping the impress of their genius and measures on the character of the town ; they have it in their power to mold its future history, and to win for themselves an honorable distinction among its sons and citizens. May their deeds be such, that later generations shall enroll their names in grateful remembrance, and some future historian find as much pleasure in recording them, as the writer of the present volume has experienced in reviewing the fortunes of their ancestors.

INDEX OF FAMILY NAMES.

Authors quoted, and persons to whom reference is made at the foot of the page, are not generally included in this index.

Abell, 159, 323, 340.	Babcock, 468, 474, 612, 670.	Bissell, 657.
Abbot, 86.	Backus, 220, 371.	Blackleach, 235.
Adams, 248, 841, 872-80, 891, 496, 410, 420, 446, 81, 450-55, 428, 489-99, 534, 532, 544, 586, 611, 667-69.	Bacon, 658.	Blake, 264.
Addis, 98, 118-116, 184, 147, 8; 388.	Bailey, (Bayley), 68, 97, 260, 6; 290, 346, 364, 564, 577.	Blakeslee, 594.
Adgate, 172.	Baker, 66, 260, 4; 290, 5; 345, 362, 4.	Blatchford, 60, 6, 8; 74, 87, 98, 110, 135, 7; 154, 6, 310.
Aery, (Arey,) 77, 250, 297.	Baldwin, 146, 156, 168, 303, 591.	Blumman, 66, 7, 9; 70, 1, 5, 6; 81, 7; 94, 5, 8; 108, 4; 111-117, 128, 144, 8; 152, 232, 235.
Albertson, 108, 512.	Barber, 459, 460, 1; 601, 641.	Bliss, 170, 2; 323, 361.
Alden, 448, 606.	Barker, 77, 582.	Block, Adrian, 21-24.
Allen, 432, 447, 8; 458, 456- 58, 476, 7; 512, 578, 9; 597, 602, 608, 611, 620, 2, 647.	Barnard, 415, 642.	Bloomfield, 98.
Allyn, 70, 1; 97, 104, 154, 157-59, 166-7; 178, 259, 354, 370, 8; 381, 415, 420, 1; 620, 668, 4.	Barnes, 64, 641, 4, 7; 682.	Bloyd, 448.
Ames, (Eams,) 264, 374, 618, 666.	Barnet, 195, 270.	Bodington, (Buddington,) 198, 264, 324.
Androes, 198, 9; 207, 223, 281.	Bartlet, 60, 1, 6; 75, 98, 5; 121, 185, 232, 274, 396-99.	Boies, 592.
Angel, 588, 582.	Bassett, 134.	Bolles, 146, 215, 259, 298, 347, 366, 8; 397, 576, 587, 595, 627.
Appleton, 350.	Batten, 178.	Borden, 75, 144, 5; 172, 303.
Apsley, 172.	Baxter, 497, 585.	Bordman, 60, 1.
Arnold, 844, 868, 884, 545- 570.	Beckwith, 70, 87, 94, 142, 209, 217, 231, 2; 248, 256, 264, 298, 557, 568, 4; 609, 611, 12.	Borrowdale, (Borrardil,) 283, 324.
Asbury, 595, 6.	Bedell, 60, 1, 4.	Boswell, 582.
Ash, 148, 338.	Beeby, 70, 1, 4; 91, 5, 8; 148, 168, 188, 5, 190, 5, 6; 202, 211, 218, 231, 248, 252, 259, 262, 8; 291, 314, 315, 338, 381, 411.	Boyle, 172.
Ashby, 264, 351.	Belden, 67, 502, 666.	Bowdoin, 398.
Ashcraft, 249, 629.	Bellamy, 452, 6.	Bowen, 93, 132, 8.
Astwood, 804.	Bemas, 60, 1; 74, 87, 136, 166, 288.	Bowers, 172.
Atwell, 146, 258, 260, 305, 342, 428.	Bemont, 341.	Bowman, 151.
Austin, 60, 61.	Benjamin, 644.	Boyce, 341.
Avery, 67, 71-74, 95-97, 127, 130, 8; 137-39, 142, 8; 152, 166, 7; 174, 180- 82, 4; 186-88, 190, 2, 5, 9; 211, 247, 251, 9; 260, 5; 280, 381, 346, 350, 415, 427, 432, 488, 519, 558, 568, 4, 7, 8; 588, 610, 11; 682.	Bennet, 96, 286, 289, 328.	Braddick, 240, 440, 1, 4; 476.
Aylmer, 687.	Bette, 396.	Bradcock, 468.
	Biddle, 510, 636.	Bradford, 171, 260, 323, 372, 431, 2; 606.
	Bill, 146, 198, 250, 9; 264, 299, 320, 346, 317, 518, 574.	Bradley, 87, 232, 38; 251, 266, 277-8; 317.
	Billings, 250, 588, 40, 604, 620, 642, 8; 662, 7.	Bradstreet, 188-144, 167, 188, 191-197, 234, 396, 668, 70.
	Bingham, 588, 588.	Brainard, 452, 571, 620, 625, 668, 8, 670.
	Birchard, 65, 251, 304.	Bramble, Sarah, 468.
	Bishop, 315, 608.	Brandegee, 624, 669.
		Breed, 286.
		Brenton, 281.

Brewster, 56, 60-67, 75, 85, 87, 8; 90, 127, 8; 138, 141, 5; 159, 162, 5; 235, 275, 278-80, 285; 317, 18; 381, 346, 363, 666.
 Briggs, 582.
 Brinley, 236.
 Broadhurst, 407.
 Brockway, 172, 248.
 Brooks, 67, 8; 98, 264, 514, 572, 586, 619, 629.
 Bromfield, Major, 562.
 Brown, 184, 178, 288, 325, 384, 517, 525, 647.
 Browne, 166, 408, 9.
 Brownell, 584.
 Bruen, 67, 71-75, 8; 84-88, 92, 8, 5; 109, 111, 118, 115, 132, 6, 9; 140, 7; 154-156, 174, 194, 247, 9; 269, 70; 280, 304, 666.
 Bryan, 148.
 Bucknall, (Buckland,) 264, 821.
 Budd, 77.
 Buel, 456, 526.
 Bulkey, 117, 181-89, 140, 161, 185, 6; 248, 252, 264, 279-80; 380, 496, 587, 574, 623.
 Buor, 289, 402, 7; 440-42.
 Bull, 65, 171.
 Burbeck, 625, 688, 4, 7.
 Burch, 488.
 Burdick, 204.
 Burnham, 398.
 Burr, 391, 2; 489.
 Burrows, (Burroughs,) 67, 75, 98, 137, 152, 269, 301, 9; 318, 363, 408, 428, 595.
 Bushnell, 546.
 Buskirk, 557.
 Bussbaw, 60, 1.
 Butler, 264, 271, 299, 342, 351, 440, 1; 662, 8.
 Button, 264.
 Byles, Mather, 489-498.
 Cady, 655.
 Camp, 264, 322, 358.
 Campbell, 431, 2.
 Cannon, 264.
 Carder, Richard, 264.
 Carpenter, 264, 303, 341, 631.
 Carr, John, 248, 9.
 Carter, 818.
 Carwithy, (Kerwithy,) 67.
 Caulkins, (Calkin,) 67, 71, 74-76, 82, 5, 8; 99; 101, 8, 10, 11, 15; 142, 154, 8; 259, 294, 308, 353, 361, 522, 552, 668.
 Chalker, 251.
 Chambers, 360.
 Chamberlin, 381.
 Champlin, 402, 7; 457, 587, 540, 680.
 Champion, 175.
 Chandler, 264, 300, 1.

Channell, 281, 2.
 Channing, 571, 7; 588-90, 668.
 Chapel(1), 145, 252, 8; 260, 325, 346, 608.
 Chapman, 98, 175, 197, 248, 250, 8; 260, 2; 308, 391, 9; 411, 479, 514, 532, 544, 561, 577, 581, 2.
 Chappell, 60, 8; 74, 136, 248, 258, 9; 268, 352, 361, 370, 475, 582, 608, 618, 662.
 Charlet, (Chelet,) 75, 299.
 Chauncey, Sarah, 132.
 Cherry, 264.
 Chesebrough, 44, 78, 85, 88, 98-104, 194, 248, 304, 662.
 Chester, 145, 231, 6, 8, 9; 248, 358, 426, 7, 485, 519, 647.
 Chew, 468, 477, 506, 589, 40.
 Chitwood, 182.
 Christophers, 117, 145, 157, 166, 170, 188, 195, 9; 235, 8; 240, 1; 251-58, 260, 1; 277, 8; 286, 308, 7, 10, 16; 386, 387, 378, 382-84, 397, 8; 401, 452, 455-57, 487, 506, 622, 666, 8, 9.
 Church, 391, 622.
 Churchwood, Hannah, 294.
 Chynnery, 87, 98, 98.
 Clap, 384, 657.
 Clark(e), 65, 206, 250, 372, 381, 8.
 Clay, 88, 248.
 Cleveland, 627, 662, 8; 671.
 Clinton, 529, 545, 556, 564.
 Codner, 77, 145, 197, 259, 289, 328.
 Coffin, 640.
 Cott(e), 62, 67, 70, 1; 84, 97, 134, 148, 4; 194, 5; 251, 5, 7, 8; 240, 4; 250, 9, 208, 276, 288, 358, 380, 60, 64; 407, 410, 476, 502, 3; 513-16, 521, 6; 532, 9; 538, 571, 9; 558, 587, 542, 632, 667-70.
 Cole, 77, 292, 399.
 Coles, Sarah, 218.
 Colfax, 264, 89, 583, 619, 627.
 Collins, 70, 87, 145, 228, 271, 289, 584.
 Comstock, 68, 8; 74, 96, 111, 118, 142, 8; 175, 244, 280, 305, 314, 16; 608, 680.
 Condy, 145, 167, 306, 353.
 Conkling, 540, 2.
 Constant, 508, 579.
 Cook, 586, 605, 6.
 Cooley, 146, 209, 274.
 Copp, 899, 432, 6.
 Corey, 316.
 Cotter, 144.
 Cowdall, 98.
 Crandall, 582.
 Crannell, 582.

Crary, 260, 4; 292, 351.
 Crawford, 649.
 Crocker, 98, 258, 8, 9; 389, 352, 361, 374, 381, 612.
 Croghan, Col., 343.
 Crombe, 300.
 Croswell, 420, 1; 454.
 Crump, 669.
 Cullick, 250.
 Cullum, 552.
 Culver, 86, 96, 184, 5, 7; 302, 308, 318, 328, 494.
 Curtiss, 243, 385, 6, 407, 450, 2, 6, 7.
 Curtenius, Peter, 507.
 Cushing, 649.
 Daboll, 656.
 Dalrymple, (Lord,) 552.
 Daniel(s), 145, 258, 60, 389, 361, 2; 408, 654, 658.
 Danforth, 341.
 Darrall, William, 235.
 Darrow, 260, 4; 339, 347, 439, 514, 532, 588, 611-18.
 Dart, 145, 269, 277, 326, 347.
 Daun, (Marshal,) 478.
 Davenport, 116, 421, 450, 454-57.
 Davie, 199, 259, 264, 415-17.
 Davis, 77, 264, 291, 360, 4; 605, 638, 642, 656.
 Davison, 239.
 Day, 514.
 Dayne, (Deane?) 145, 315.
 Dea, (Deane?) 145.
 Dean(e), 507, 608.
 Decatur, 630-37.
 De Jean, 579.
 Delamore, (Dillarmer,) 366.
 Denison, 77, 82, 5, 7, 8; 98, 103, 4, 6, 9; 115, 130, 155, 185-88, 194, 348, 9; 252, 8; 264, 271, 286, 297, 318, 332, 9; 347, 359, 363, 389, 391, 8; 428, 432, 3, 663, 7.
 Dennis, 264, 292, 348, 600, 624.
 Denslow, 188.
 Deshon, 370, 447, 484, 503, 5, 6; 517, 19; 523, 527, 9; 570, 582, 619, 641, 2, 666, 9.
 Dewolf, Edw., 192.
 Dickinson, 668.
 Dixon, 481.
 Do(a)ne, 160, 392.
 Dodge, 264, 392, 428, 508.
 Dolbear, 657.
 Dolph, 634.
 Dorrance, 418.
 Doty, 618.
 Dongins, 98, 124-144, 188, 5; 194, 259, 273, 4; 286, 291, 5; 300, 8; 325, 353, 8; 363, 7; 378, 401, 508, 512, 524, 532, 595, 610, 627, 641, 2; 666, 7.
 Dow, Ulysses, 622.
 Downer, Joshua, 567.
 Downing, 118.

Doxey, 68, 75, 82, 157, 232, 268.
 Dudley, 198, 304, 412, 18; 498.
 Dunke, 251.
 Durfey, 239, 360, 386, 390, 402, 8, 10; 462.
 Durkee, 583.
 Durell, 478.
 Dwight, 171, 4; 373.
 Dyer, 280, 478, 507, 520.
 Dymond, 146, 232, 6; 261, 278, 9; 288, 311, 350.
 Eaton, 311.
 Edgecombe, 188, 241, 259, 264, 346, 370, 444, 560.
 Edgerton, 583.
 Edwards, 96, 456, 592.
 Eells, 450, 1, 666.
 Eidlitz, 591.
 Elderkin, 97, 8; 82, 5, 8; 96, 108, 9; 182, 154, 6, 8, 9; 191, 281, 306, 356, 518, 19.
 Eldridge, 502, 657.
 Ellard, 402.
 Elliot, 188, 146, 197, 332, 386, 429, 656.
 Ellis, 145, 264.
 Ely, 475.
 Elmore, Edw., 188.
 Elsing, 269.
 Elton, 240.
 Ely, 171, 218, 250, 2; 351, 521, 24, 26.
 Endicott, 29, 34, 113.
 Epes, 193.
 Erving, 512, 628.
 Eyre, (Col.) 546, 550, 7, 8; 560, 8, 4.
 Fairbanks, 326, 481.
 Fanning, 96, 142; 5; 306.
 Fargo, 284, 378, 514.
 Farnsworth, 623.
 Fenwick, 27, 8; 48, 6; 172-4, 250.
 Fish, 96, 269, 310, 14, 15; 415, 452.
 Fisk, 422.
 Fitch, 187, 152, 185, 211, 12; 249, 371, 8; 385, 392, 426-29; 438, 551, 688, 641, 847.
 Fitzpatrick, 600.
 Fones, 40.
 Foote, 264, 308, 346.
 Forbes, 60, 159.
 Ford, 310.
 Forster, (Foster,) 146, 235, 306, 312, 586.
 Forth, 39.
 Fosdick, 264, 286, 348, 368, 379, 380, 397, 532, 4, 7; 574-5; 625, 649, 668.
 Fossiker, (Fossecar,) 60, 1; 75.
 Fountain, 264, 339.
 Fowler, 409.

Fox, 198, 202, 212, 259, 262, 4; 272; 308, 322, 370, 7; 436, 502.
 Francis, 657.
 Franklin, 416, 551.
 Freebutter, 666.
 Freeman, 448, 560.
 French, 272.
 Frink, 192, 329, 351, 549, 620, 647, 668.
 Fry, 269, 70.
 Fryer, 118.
 Gager, 59, 66, 74, 93, 7; 154, 8; 9; 268, 292.
 Gale, 596.
 Gallop, 29, 37, 68, 74, 9; 87, 98, 144, 154, 184, 291, 329, 351, 502, 526, 532, 559.
 Gammon, 363.
 Gard, 146.
 Gardiner, 26, 34, 173, 241, 301, 388, 4; 398, 408, 8; 416, 471, 496, 610, 640, 670, 1.
 Garland, 637.
 Garlick, 77.
 Garmand, 146.
 Gary, 300.
 Gaylord, 159.
 Geer, 97, 157, 259, 354, 378, 415, 420, 502, 599.
 George, (Bishop,) 596.
 Gerrard, 281, 298.
 Geabie, 77.
 Gibbons, 152.
 Gibbs, 238.
 Gibson, 261, 2; 262, 4; 457, 476, 622.
 Gifford, 292.
 Gilbert, 264, 428, 436.
 Goddard, 244, 440, 1, 4; 627, 8, 669.
 Gordon, 637.
 Gorges, 386.
 Gorton, 436-39.
 Gove, 243.
 Graham, (Lord Lyndock,) 654.
 Grant, 145, 298.
 Graves, 330, 366, 445-47; 486, 531.
 Gray, 189, 360.
 Green, 260, 4; 330, 341, 357, 379, 391, 2; 471, 2, 8; 486, 8, 9; 510, 628, 647, 666, 6, 669.
 Greenslade, 331.
 Greenwood, 599.
 Griffin, 84, 338, 367, 596, 664.
 Gridley, 440.
 Grignon, 506.
 Griswold, 172, 208, 9; 251, 288, 385, 486, 8; 616, 631.
 Griswold, Matthew, 126, 161-177; 208, 9; 248, 251.
 Grose, 244.
 Gulliver, 369.

Gurdon, Mariel, 383.
 Gurley, 628, 662, 9, 671.
 Hackburn, (Hagborn,) 184, 152.
 Hackley, 264, 404.
 Hadley, 252.
 Hale, Nathan, 515, 534, 622.
 Haley, 634.
 Hall, 135, 258, 8; 265, 431.
 Hallam, 182, 193, 222-28, 236, 38; 244, 268, 262, 286, 335, 341, 358, 399, 406, 441, 476, 499, 514, 532, 3; 552, 594, 662, 3, 7, 8; 670.
 Hallet, William, 60, 4.
 Hallsall, (Hansell,) 144, 281.
 Halsey, 200, 266, 559, 576.
 Hamlin, Giles, 235, 240.
 Hammond, 605, 611.
 Hancock, 510.
 Handy, 508.
 Hanshut, 74, 5.
 Harding, 365, 538-40.
 Hardy, 630-33.
 Harman, 643.
 Harris, 84-88, 143, 240, 258, 9; 269, 275, 292, 320, 388, 8; 342, 396, 425, 8; 452, 3; 474, 5; 512, 598, 647.
 Harrison, (Gen.) 362.
 Hartley, 87, 137, 148, 152, 280.
 Harvey, 265, 348.
 Harwood, 70, 5; 95, 274, 368.
 Hatch, 262, 5.
 Haughton, 75, 102, 127, 149, 150, 247, 8; 262, 299, 388, 342, 374, 425.
 Haven, 647.
 Havens, 537, 540, 1; 640.
 Hawke, 265, 339.
 Hayden, 295, 538.
 Haynes, (Haines,) 88, 90, 102, 145, 251, 262, 5, 308, 9; 314, 384, 487.
 Hazard, 582.
 Hearn, 544.
 Hempstead, 44, 57, 8; 60, 66-72, 75, 81, 7; 95, 227, 260, 272, 288, 7; 301, 310, 15; 321, 359, 366, 400, 1, 9; 466, 518, 532, 4, 568, 6, 582.
 Henshaw, 594.
 Hertell, 448, 508.
 Hewet, 307.
 Hicks, 409.
 Hide, (Hyde,) 418, 514, 655, 667.
 Higby, 60.
 Higginson, 48.
 Hill, 126, 143, 5, 8; 157, 166, 188, 8; 190, 5; 235, 251, 260, 286, 307, 317, 396, 427, 8; 348, 428, 432, 458, 621, 7; 666.
 Hillhouse, 418, 432-34, 502, 8, 6; 606, 667, 8.

Hinman, 509, 511, 537, 9; 541, 2; 574, 625, 651.
 Hiscox, 204.
 Holloway, 265, 356.
 Holmes, 198, 265.
 Holmsted, 172.
 Holt, 265, 314, 389, 583, 5; 655, 657.
 Hooker, 431.
 Hooper, 412.
 Hope, 242.
 Hopkins, 509-11, 518, 20; 537, 671.
 Hoesmer, 380, 680.
 Hotham, (Admiral), 637.
 How, 279.
 Howard, 457, 611, 12; 636, 640.
 Howell, 640.
 Howland, 658.
 Hubbard, 204, 7; 265, 70; 312, 18; 349, 406, 427, 448, 476, 502, 640, 668, 70.
 Hubbell, 265, 388, 367.
 Hughes, 281, 654.
 Hull, 463, 477.
 Hungerford, 68, 9; 75, 86, 152, 7; 281.
 Hunter, 219.
 Hunting, 640.
 Huntington, 159, 172, 325, 518, 16, 18; 577, 589, 90; 631, 8, 5, 648, 649, 658, 662, 8, 670.
 Huntley, 296, 305.
 Hurd, 818.
 Hurlbut, 265, 358, 502, 532, 3; 579, 582, 502, 603, 622, 8; 668, 9.
 Hutchinson, 265, 514.
 Hutton, 240, 1.

Ingason, 77.
 Inglis, 642.
 Ingraham, 586.
 Ireland, 301.
 Isbell, 67, 71, 97, 272, 289, 342.
 Isham, 620, 638, 662, 671.
 Jacklin, 382.
 Jackson, 218, 19; 409.
 Jarvis, 448.
 Jayne, 637.
 Jeffers, 198.
 Jeffrey, 241, 2, 4.
 Jennings, 266, 360.
 Jewett, 434, 6; 451, 3; 468, 605.
 Jiggs, 344, 379.
 Johnson, 266, 343, 359, 421, 486.
 Johnston, 608.
 Jones, 70, 197, 218, 265, 288, 307, 311, 329, 363, 428, 587, 636.
 Jordan, 202.
 Joyner, Isabel, 321.
 Judd, 594.

Kay, 440.
 Kearney, 661.
 Keith, 410.
 Keeny, 67, 71, 5; 94, 148, 4; 231, 259, 291, 306, 339, 346, 352, 361, 509, 587.
 Ketchell, 155.
 Kidd, 298.
 Kimball, 619.
 Kimberly, 262.
 King, 891, 3.
 Kinney, (Kinne), 601.
 Kirby, 188.
 Kirtland, 419, 521.
 Knight, 364, 6; 371, 628.

Laboisiere, 580.
 La Fayette, 510.
 Lake, 44, 5, 7; 68, 77, 87, 98, 154, 238, 291.
 Lamb, 327, 485, 538.
 Landseer, 606.
 Lane, 138, 154, 7; 161, 281, 8; 269, 270.
 Larrabee, 273, 282.
 Latham, 44, 58, 9; 64, 70, 4; 89, 97, 8; 103, 133, 5, 6; 163-67, 258, 306, 312, 18; 324, 385, 344, 9; 355, 401, 526, 546.
 Lothrop, See Lothrop.
 Latimer, (Lattemore), 144, 171, 198, 227, 8; 231, 2; 251, 9; 286, 8; 302, 326, 9; 359, 382, 408, 471, 504, 518, 15, 518, 526, 532, 551, 582, 8; 602.
 Law, 218, 394, 476, 502-506, 544, 575, 619-25, 649, 652, 667, 8, 9; 670.
 Lawrence, 270, 316, 647, 663.
 Lay, 152, 175, 7; 292, 334.
 Leach, 265, 299, 374.
 Leake, (Lake), 110, 288.
 Learned, 623, 662, 7, 8, 9; 670, 1.
 Lechmere, 412, 441, 477.
 Ledyard, 244, 384, 407, 502, 518, 20; 521, 8; 530, 546, 8; 558, 9; 561, 2, 5, 7; 575, 608.
 Lee, 170, 5, 6; 252, 391, 458, 470, 9; 584, 595, 6; 616, 17, 641.
 Leeds, 236, 7; 244, 265, 312, 335, 337, 8; 540, 582.
 Leet, 470.
 Lefevre, (Fevor), 428.
 Leffingwell, 185, 470, 577.
 Leighton, (Lawton), 78.
 Lemoine, (Capt.), 666.
 Lenard, 93.
 Lennison, 274.
 Leslie, (Capt.), 478.
 Lester, 67, 71, 82, 96, 7; 116, 152; 198, 260, 278, 286, 310, 321, 340, 2, 6; 362, 370, 1; 411, 612, 649.

Lewis, 60, 6; 74, 6; 144, 201, 250, 9; 295, 325, 448, 663, 8.
 Lippitt, 620.
 Liveen, (Living), 222-228, 236, 7; 258, 358.
 Livingston, 257, 357, 364, 378, 5, 381, 404, 412, 428, 9; 438.
 Lockwood, 87, 306, 312.
 Longdon, 58, 60, 1; 74, 111, 284.
 Loomer, 265, 327, 340.
 Lord, 91, 133, 152-54, 235, 317, 384, 456.
 Lothrop, (Lothrop), 57, 60, 4, 6; 96, 123, 7; 182, 154, 9; 191, 240, 294, 303, 391, 2; 581.
 Loudon, (Earl of), 469.
 Lovelace, Gov., 337.
 Loveland, Rob., 98, 138, 151, 238, 4.
 Ludlow, 38.
 Lynde, 189, 218, 360, 468.
 Lyndock, (Lord), 654.
 Mack, 617.
 Mackensie, 197, 235.
 McCarty, 385, 540, 582.
 McCurdy, Sally, 589.
 McDonald, 592, 657.
 McEwen, 574, 590, 629, 667, 8; 672.
 McKay, 640.
 McLellan, 518.
 McSparran, 440-42, 446.
 Madison, 477.
 Malbone, 300.
 Mallison, 563.
 Maniere, 579.
 Manning, 378, 657.
 Manwaring, 129, 145, 170, 240, 1; 252, 8, 9; 268, 292, 317, 18; 347, 352, 361, 4, 6; 403, 444, 502, 532, 624, 668.
 Maples, 431.
 Marritt, (Marret), 141, 230, 249, 259, 314.
 Marsey, 428.
 Marshall, 70, 1, 5; 145, 248, 314, 347.
 Martin, 67, 145, 549.
 Marvin, 175, 262.
 Mason, 85, 6, 8; 43, 51, 5; 64, 78, 9; 81, 98, 104-6, 120, 6, 7; 164, 5; 170, 2, 4; 7; 180, 2, 4; 227, 249, 308, 381, 410, 121, 426, 8; 430, 3.
 Masters, 60, 74, 5; 812.
 Mather, 195, 7; 373, 416, 489, 498, 620, 651, 669.
 Mattie, 300.
 Mayhew, 236, 240, 265, 290, 316, 336, 361.
 Maynard, 265, 354, 610.
 Meach, 607.
 Meacham, 456.

Meades, 70, 1, 96, 144, 266, 359, 415.
 Measure, 145, 249, 281, 384.
 McAlly, 588, 624.
 Mercer, 662, 671.
 Merrick, Stephen, 250.
 Merrill(s), 389, 582.
 Merritt, 400, 432, 8; 440, 1.
 Messenger, 77, 89.
 Michel, 627.
 Migges, 270.
 Mighill, (Mitchell?) 265, 380.
 Milburne, 222.
 Miller, 244, 327, 340, 46; 384-86, 391, 8, 9; 477, 482, 502, 547, 553, 584, 622, 669.
 Mills, 622, 649.
 Millett, 549, 560.
 Milwood, 118.
 Minor, (Miner,) 44, 56-61, 64, 8; 72, 74-76, 80-85, 98, 101-4, 128, 130, 143, 4; 162, 3, 8; 188, 195, 6; 237, 280, 5; 302, 326, 374, 459, 647, 656.
 Minter, 265, 283, 362.
 Mitchell, 265, 383, 628.
 Moffatt, 478, 497, 511.
 Montgomery, 558, 560, 4.
 Moore, 93, 193, 8; 260, 278, 310, 14; 321.
 Morgan, 70, 71, 96, 98, 115, 132, 3; 185-89, 142-44, 162, 161, 2, 6; 198, 9; 251, 259-61, 266, 282, 294, 311, 12, 19; 346, 350, 377, 416, 418-20, 604.
 Morris, (Morrice,) 297, 409, 509.
 Morse, 606, 611.
 Mortimer, 266, 354.
 Morton, Wm., 45, 58, 7; 60, 6; 75, 116, 133, 149, 150, 2; 287.
 Mott, 520, 1.
 Mould, 188, 4; 231, 235-37; 260, 275.
 Mudge, 60, 74, 82, 269, 289, 322.
 Mulford, 817.
 Mumford, 244, 409, 441, 4, 8; 470, 502, 5, 6; 517, 532, 7; 543, 565, 577, 582, 622, 667, 8.
 Munsell, (Munson?) 265, 358.
 Murphy, 542.
 Murray, 586.
 Mussey, 649.
 Mynard, (Maynard?) 258, 265, 327, 354, 428.
 Nash, 251.
 Nest, 265, 324, 356.
 Nettleton, 818.
 Newbury, 618.
 Newman, 96, 152.

Newton, 391, 2.
 Nicholls, 60, 6, 6; 74, 121, 138, 141, 4; 198, 270, 2; 289, 342. Gov., 46, 157.
 Nicholson, James, 548.
 Niles, 588, 629.
 Nixon, 514.
 Norcott, 582.
 Norris, 442.
 North, 281, 671.
 Northrop, 289.
 Norton, 27, 30, 118, 441.
 Nott, 571.
 Noyes, James, 106, 130, 285, 297, 379. Moses, 285.
 Oakes, Edw., 195.
 Ogleby, 344.
 Oldham, 28, 9.
 Oliver, 233, 477, 540, 682.
 Olmsted, 628.
 Otis, 432, 8, 5; 579.
 Owen, 418-20, 454, 619-22, 667.
 Packer, 70, 5; 96, 128, 312, 16; 324, 7; 347, 9; 417, 440, 1, 4.
 Packwood, 578, 582.
 Paget, 402.
 Paine, 427.
 Palmer, 102, 4; 278, 285, 297, 304, 326, 334, 526, 577, 606.
 Palmea, 90, 1, 4, 5; 143, 152, 164-68, 170, 180, 83-89, 195, 223-27, 239, 249-53, 341, 380, 1, 4; 396, 402, 444, 666, 9.
 Parke, 56, 66, 7, 9, 70, 73-76, 95-98, 102-4, 8, 15; 188, 152, 158, 192, 268, 282, 811, 15; 472, 571.
 Parker, 67, 69-70, 73-76, 135, 144, 161, 6; 183, 231, 8; 291, 306, 312, 328, 353, 4; 448, 472, 524, 539; 541, 655.
 Parkin, 624, 668.
 Parry, 289.
 Parsons, 450, 3; 479, 508, 8; 513, 14; 528, 9.
 Patrick, 36.
 Patten, 586.
 Peake, (Pike,) 142, 5; 314, 16; 325.
 Pease, 250.
 Peck, 599.
 Pell, 138.
 Peinber, 265, 355.
 Pemberton, 265, 345.
 Pendall, 266.
 Pendleton, 616.
 Perkins, 286, 514, 615, 620, 644, 647, 662, 3, 7, 8; 671.
 Persey, 265.
 Peters, 28, 40, 43-47, 52, 3; 566, 7.
 Peterson, 252.
 Phillips, 85, 146, 434.


Phipps, 256.
 Picket, 76, 86, 97, 125, 152, 171, 198, 236, 8; 240, 1; 260, 276, 7; 285, 308, 318, 344, 350, 368, 470, 668.
 Pickworth, 77.
 Pierce, 325, 436.
 Pierpont, 452.
 Pierson, 156, 350.
 Pigot, 549, 630.
 Pinevert, 580.
 Piriou, (Pereau,) 579, 622.
 Plaisted, 240.
 Plimpton, 265.
 Plumbe, 91, 288, 250, 2, 8, 9; 265, 302, 336, 378, 398, 401, 428, 488, 670.
 Polly, 348.
 Pomeroy, 456.
 Pool(e), 70, 132, 278, 290, 307, 544, 579.
 Porter, 663.
 Post, 60, 2, 9; 76, 88, 141, 156, 303.
 Potter, 475, 595, 628.
 Potts, 265, 346.
 Powell, 444.
 Powers, 159, 582.
 Pratt, 208, 9; 249, 298, 416, 499.
 Prentis, (Prentice,) 88, 87, 94, 135, 6, 9; 141, 4; 152, 167, 170, 196, 208, 218, 235, 8; 240, 1; 252, 8, 9; 288, 295, 318, 326, 8; 360, 1; 382, 6, 6; 391-94; 398, 408, 4; 427, 8; 437, 8; 502, 647, 670.
 Prior, 518.
 Proctor, 318, 388.
 Prout, 285, 371, 8.
 Prowse, 308.
 Prudden, 201.
 Prychard, 111.
 Punderson, 420.
 Pygan, 142, 199, 223, 5; 284, 7; 250, 1; 262, 8; 279, 341, 359, 446, 669.
 Pynchou, 96, 188, 4; 202.
 Quarry, 239.
 Randall, 288.
 Ransford, 216-18.
 Rathbone, 437.
 Rawlins, 270.
 Rawson, 584.
 Ray, 240, 642.
 Raymond, 88, 98, 117, 184, 145, 165, 181, 3, 4; 258, 262, 292, 301, 317, 18; 323, 351, 367, 396, 400, 426, 6; 432, 8, 5; 514, 532, 8; 606, 627.
 Read, (Reed,) 40, 77, 145, 475.
 Redfield, (Redfyn,) 250, 279, 290, 341.
 Reeve, 671.


Revell, (Reavell,) 147, 8; 162, 280.
 Reynolds, 172, 188, 360.
 Rice, 108, 265, 346, 582, 625, 644.
 Richards, 152, 228, 253, 385, 384, 383, 404, 5, 8; 416, 502, 8; 532, 7; 552, 562, 582, 619, 622.
 John, 98, 258, 9; 268, 318, 364, 7; 381, 6; 398, 487, 682, 8, 9.
 Richardson, 76, 86, 91, 9; 123, 152, 250, 302, 356, 441, 622.
 Ripley, 159, 640.
 Roach, 77, 8; 268, 279.
 Roberts, 67, 71, 87, 142, 154, 6; 163, 274, 9.
 Robinson, 57, 60, 1; 138, 146, 390, 456, 471, 549.
 Rockwell, 188.
 Rodgers, 661.
 Rogers, 74, 84, 90-92, 95, 6, 8; 108-110, 116, 188-189, 148, 4, 7; 152, 184, 6; 188, 199, 200-221, (Ch. xiv.) 227, 237, 240, 4; 251, 9; 286, 297, 322, 380, 7, 9; 345, 365, 398, 400, 1, 8, 4, 9; 426, 7, 8; 436, 471, 491, 538, 542, 568, 582, 610, 618, 14; 647, 658.
 Rose, 158, 261, 354.
 Rosewell, Eliz., 383.
 Rose-Morgan. See Morgan.
 Roseter, 456.
 Rowland, 201.
 Rowe, 436, 7.
 Royce, 98, 5; 139, 140-44; 152, 154, 160, 311.
 Rudd, 48.
 Ruddock, 654, 658.
 Russell, 265.
 Sadler, 111, 113.
 Sage, 540.
 Saltostall, 196-98, 213, 15, 16; 224, 244, 262, 8; 295, 318, 376, 9; 382-91, 409, 418, 427, 8; 430, 462-65, 471, 486, 502-4, 509, 513, 517-21, 526, 581, 7; 548, 45, 552, 577, 581, 619, 682, 687-70.
 Sanford, 235.
 Sands, 293.
 Satterly, (Shatterly,) 265, 288.
 Savage, 133, 152.
 Savell, 470.
 Saxton, Hannah, 384.
 Sayre, 313, 641.
 Scarborough, 658.
 Scarritt, (Skarritt,) 265, 428.
 Scofield, 657.
 Scott, 69.
 Seabury, 265, 320, 419, 420, 449-45, 592-95, 600, 608, 626, 670.
 Seaman, 655.
 Searle, 285.
 Seymour, 563, 4; 661.
 Shackmaple, 289, 410, 441, 4, 477, 679.
 Shapley, 146, 236, 9; 259, 286, 317, 343, 456, 521, 6; 546, 9; 558, 561, 7; 579.
 Sharwood, 146, 308, 347.
 Shaw, 98, 242, 8; 256, 338, 344, 442, 8, 7; 474, 5; 482, 85, 498, 502-12, 519-21, 538, 548, 8; 570, 588, 619, 622, 637.
 Sherman, 629, 671.
 Shipman, 518.
 Shirley, 468, 9.
 Shepherd, (Shepard,) 333, 595.
 Shore, 75.
 Short, 367, 471.
 Shrimpton, 189.
 Shubrick, 637.
 Singleton, 266, 355.
 Sistare, 488, 4; 665, 9.
 Sizer, 598.
 Skidmore, 60, 1; 232.
 Skillinger, (Skillinger,) 188, 6; 152, 247.
 Skinner, 583.
 Skolinks, 240.
 Sloan, 483, 474.
 Smedley, 638.
 Smith, 60, 61, 88-86; 92, 8, 6; 109, 135, 6, 8; 142, 4; 150, 1; 168, 171, 2, 5; 198, 9; 202, 6, 9; 252, 8; 259, 61, 294, 9; 321, 2; 358, 362, 370, 404, 415, 437, 440, 1; 516, 544, 617, 631, 643, 4; 647, 669.
 Southmead, (Southmayd,) 148, 388.
 Sparrow, 582.
 Spencer, 157, 281.
 Spicer, 146, 385, 518.
 Spooner, 655.
 Sprague, 488.
 Springer, 266, 656.
 Squire, 639.
 Stafford, 145.
 Stallion, (Sterling?) 68, 75, 84, 138, 152, 232, 7; 251, 308, 326, 7; 346, 366.
 Stanton, 28, 65, 66-68, 75, 88, 101, 106, 128, 181, 202, 237, 249, 285, 296, 326, 334, 428, 558, 9.
 Stapleton, 556.
 Starke, 96, 142, 318, 436, 7.
 Starr, 145, 241, 250, 1, 9; 277, 9; 312, 18; 415, 644, 675, 692, 615.
 Stebbins, 44, 57, 9; 60, 5; 73, 4; 81, 96, 143, 259, 268, 314, 321.
 Stedman, 68, 9; 282, 272, 287, 9; 342, 371.
 Steer, 213, 286, 380.
 Sterling, 242, 440, 1.
 Stevens, 113, 151, 231, 9; 250, 270, 5; 292, 341.
 Stewart, 351, 408, 444, 474, 476-78, 511, 12; 584, 618, 622, 658.
 Stillman, 574.
 Stinwick, 282.
 Stiles, 588.
 Stockman, 595, 662.
 Stoddard, 84, 159, 354, 419, 420, 647.
 Stone, 27-30, 665.
 Stoughton, 36-38, 42, 98, 106, 6.
 Strickland, 259, 266.
 Sullivan, 411.
 Sullaven, 145, 479.
 Sutton, 344.
 Swaddel, 286, 346.
 Swain, 640, 2.
 Swan, 598, 9.
 Sweezy, 288, 456.
 Sybada, 68, 350.
 Sylvester, 148.
 Taber, 70, 4; 243, 486, 8; Tappin, 84.
 Talcott, 104, 174, 8; 185, 6; 885.
 Talmam, 290.
 Tailimage, 532.
 Taylor, 66, 7; 74, 223, 4; 416, 477.
 Tennent, 449.
 Terrall, (Tyrrel,) 145, 259, 310, 357.
 Thatcher, 452, 625, 662.
 Thomas, 112.
 Thomson, (Thompson,) 108, 116, 128, 9; 182, 3, 6; 149, 150, 2; 235, 313, 382, 412, 476, 536, 606, 682.
 Thorne, 266, 291, 346.
 Throop, 526.
 Tibbot, (Tybott,) 111, 118.
 Tilley, 440, 628.
 Tillinghast, 240.
 Tinker, 92, 3, 5; 116, 132, 8, 6; 147, 9; 150, 248, 9; 280, 384.
 Tompkins, 155.
 Tongue, (Tonge,) 68, 88, 9; 101, 7; 184, 152, 233, 250, 274, 8; 289, 357, 427, 8.
 Townsend, 286.
 Towson, 146.
 Tozor, 339.
 Tracy, 161, 2.
 Treat, 188, 6; 223, 262.
 Treby, 146, 663.
 Trott, 621, 657.
 Trowbridge, 371.
 Truman, 142, 146, 260, 337, 350, 9.
 Trumbull, 466, 517, 542, 8.

Tubbs, 145, 310.	Waters, 519, 20.	4, 6; 94, 9; 148, 157, 250, 287, 310, 321, 7; 348, 354.
Tudor, 240.	Watson, 60, 324, 8; 428, 431, 545, 570.	Williams, 24, 44, 55, 99, 107, 123, 145, 159, 248, 260, 6; 277, 308, 313, 346, 8, 9; 355, 430, 458, 456, 502, 558, 567-69, 591, 9; 610, 629, 634, 641-44, 647, 662, 4, 7, 9.
Tupper, 534.	Way, 211, 252, 260, 266, 328, 358, 6; 362, 619, 667.	Williston, 622.
Turner, 236, 243, 266, 277, 8; 291, 317, 320, 346, 662.	Weaver, 480, 516, 582, 647.	Willoughby, 252, 266.
Tuthill, 279, 456.	Webb, 515.	Wilson, 36-38, 112, 138, 240, 820, 8; 662.
Tuttle, 422, 602.	Wedge, Mary, 252.	Winchester, 823.
Tyler, 448, 530, 566.	Weeks, 266, 270.	Winslow, 112.
Updike, 344.	Wells, 60, 74, 287, 312, 355, 6; 526.	Winthrop. See, generally, the first five chapters; also, 116, 128, 6; 147, 152, 4, 9; 184-96, 189, 180-83, 188, 90, 194-96, 200, 1; 216, 228, 235, 27, 239, 250, 1; 258-62, 270, 284, 5, 7, 290, 4; 300, 387, 345, 357, 360, 6, 9; 375, 384, 402-4, 408-16, 427, 8; 575, 668, 670.
Upham, 549-52.	Wescote, 486, 614.	Wolcott, 174, 391, 2; 409, 494, 621, 548, 586, 619.
Upjohn, 584.	West, 325, 598, 618, 662.	Wood, 60, 98, 308, 324, 5; 370, 628.
Underhill, 29-36.	Wetherell, 93, 185-87, 140, 160, 5, 6; 180, 1, 4, 5, 9; 194, 5; 198, 9; 206, 211, 18, 16; 230, 249, 250, 8; 258-62, 271, 7, 9; 286, 294, 7; 322, 334, 342, 363, 396, 428, 666, 7.	Woodbridge, 197, 379, 416, 18; 498-500, 512, 586, 670, 1.
Vandervoort, 507.	Wetmore, 373.	Woodmancy, 146, 313, 560, 563.
Vernon, 387.	Wharton, 475, 507, 8.	Woodward, 585, 602, 628.
Vibert, (Vibber,) 432.	Wheat, 824, 658.	Wooster, 391.
Vincent, 77.	Wheeler, 146, 288, 252, 8; 260, 290, 330, 475.	Worthington, 605.
Vine, Mary, 311, 661.	White, 56, 574.	Wright, 638, 670.
Wadsworth, 280, 409, 431.	Whitefield, 421, 458-60.	Yorke, 388.
Wait, 508, 622, 7.	Whitford, 467.	Young, 266, 278.
Wales, 520.	Whiting, 365, 378-82, 391, 429, 638.	
Walker, 266, 410.	Whitlock, 560.	
Wallace, 510, 18.	Whittingham, 383.	
Waller, 68, 9; 75, 111, 182, 162, 8, 7, 8; 176, 250, 260, 273, 4; 321, 370, 404.	Wickham, 288.	
Wallis, 173.	Wickwire, 260, 6; 290, 357.	
Walton, 661.	Wightman, 422, 436, 9.	
Walworth, 244, 266, 345, 409.	Wilkins, 160.	
Wanton, 409.	Willard, 195.	
Ward, 391.	Willett, 266, 598.	
Waring, 325.	Willey, 44, 56, 7; 60, 4; 72, 74-76, 95, 177, 248, 295.	
Warner, 238.		
Warren, 393, 599, 626.		
Washburn, 596.		
Washington, 468, 9; 482, 508, 10, 18.		
Wass, Eliz., 486.		
Waterhouse, 44, 59, 60, 1; 74-76, 95, 177, 248, 295.		

NAMES OF INDIANS.

Ben-Uncas, 410, 429, 478.	Mejuarnes, 170.	Robin. (See Cassasina-mon.)
Canonchet, 187.	Menowniet, 188.	Sassacus, 20, 31, 34, 27, 31, 4, 7; 55, 120, 423.
Canonicus, 32.	Miantonomoh, 38, 48.	Sassyous, (Sashious,) 27.
Cashawasset, 52, 129, 130. (Same as Harmon Garrett and Wequashkook.)	Momoho (Mamaho,) 24, 180, 184, 5, 7.	Tatobam, 21.
Cassasinamon, 52, 79, 128, 129, 130, 184, 5, 7. (Same as Robin.)	Nanasquee, 184.	Tatto-bitton, 170.
Cesar, 410, 429-431.	Niles, Harry, 629, 30.	Toby, 604.
Foxen, 54, 57, 128, 250.	Ninigret, (Nimnicraft,) 99, 184.	Tomquash, 184.
Garrett, Harmon. See Cashawasset.	Nowequa. (See Waweequa.)	Towtukhag, 250.
Garrett, Kate, 410, 530.	Obed, 171.	Uncas, 20, 21, 35, 8; 43, 6; 51-55; 64, 8; 79, 101, 120, 126-29, 162-65, 181, 5, 250, 2; 261, 299, 426-27, 611.
Josiah, 353, 425.	Occulish, (Okkuish,) 576, 588, 617.	Waweequa, 53, 54. (Same as Waakeus and Nowequa.)
Jumpé, 250.	Owaneco, 185, 185, 7; 261, 353, 410, 425 30.	Wequashkook, 52. (See Cashawasset.)
Kutshamokin, 31, 32.	Paguran, 170.	Wopequoit, (Wopequand.) (See Pekoath.)
Magnus, 186.	Pekoath, 21, (same as Wopequoit.)	Yotash, 37.
Manomet, 410.	Pessacus, 43.	
Mamaraka-gurgana, (the Giant,) 170, 252.	Philip, 181, 6.	
	Pomham, Ruth, 625	
	Puttaquonck-quame, 37.	






WIDENER LIBRARY

Harvard College, Cambridge, MA 02138: (617) 495-2413

If the item is recalled, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return. (Non-receipt of overdue notices does not exempt the borrower from overdue fines.)



Thank you for helping us to preserve our collection!



